

Illinois U. Library

THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

Volume XXX

October, 1955

Number 2

Faculty Freedom

Six Decades of Progress

Liberal Arts and Education Education

Role of Graduate Schools in
Teacher Education

Cooperative Study of Secondary-School
Standards After Twenty-One Years

Treasurer's Report

Sixty-first Annual Meeting, April 9-13,
1956, Palmer House, Chicago

THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

*The Official Organ of the North Central Association of Colleges
and Secondary Schools*

EDITORIAL BOARD

HARLAN C. KOCH, Ann Arbor, Michigan
Managing Editor

CHARLES W. BOARDMAN

Minneapolis, Minnesota

J. FRED MURPHY

Indianapolis, Indiana

NORMAN BURNS

Chicago, Illinois

R. NELSON SNIDER

Fort Wayne, Indiana

A. J. GIBSON

Charleston, West Virginia

J. EDGAR STONECIPHER

Des Moines, Iowa

THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY is published by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools on the first day of July, October, January, and April. It is the official organ of the Association, and contains the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Association, together with much additional material directly related to the work of the Association. The regular subscription price is \$4.00 a year. The July number is priced at \$1.75; the others, \$1.00 each. All members of the Association—institutional and individual—are entitled to receive the QUARTERLY as part of their annual fees. A special subscription price of \$3.00 per year is permitted to school libraries, college libraries, and public libraries and to individuals connected with North Central Association membership institutions.

Publication Office: The George Banta Publishing Company, Menasha, Wisconsin.

Executive and Editorial Office: 4019 University High School Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Entered as Second-Class matter at the Post Office at Menasha, Wisconsin, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 8, 1919.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

Volume XXX

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER

Number 2



PAGE

ASSOCIATION NOTES AND EDITORIAL COMMENTS	169
The Cooperative Study Marches On—Ninth Annual Meeting of State Chairmen—New Regulations Governing Appeals from Commission Decisions—Plans for a Study of High School Social Experiences and Organizations—Sticking to Our Own Knitting—Let's Have a Wider Audience for the Liberal Arts Study—New Committee to Execute Athletic Plans—Committee on Graduate Study in Education—Interest in High School-College Articulation Continues—A Significant Annual Event in Illinois—Representatives to Annual Meetings of Other Regional Associations—Visitors to American Dependents' Schools—Public School Graduates Make Good—Federal Bulletin Analyzes Accreditation of High Schools in the Several States—Bylaws of the Commission on Colleges and Universities—Contributors to This Issue.	
FACULTY FREEDOM: ADMINISTRATIVELY VIEWED	<i>Ordway Tread</i> 186
SIX DECADES OF PROGRESS	<i>Milo Bail</i> 193
LIBERAL ARTS AND EDUCATION EDUCATION	<i>Victor A. Rapport</i> 208
ROLE OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS IN TEACHER EDUCATION: A STUDY OF TEN GRADUATE PROGRAMS	<i>Robert W. McCulloch</i> 211
COOPERATIVE STUDY OF SECONDARY-SCHOOL STANDARDS AFTER TWENTY-ONE YEARS	<i>Carl A. Jessen</i> 219
TREASURER'S REPORT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR, JULY 1, 1954 TO JUNE 30, 1955	<i>Nelson R. Snider</i> 226



THE
NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION
QUARTERLY

October
1955

Volume XXX
Number 2

Association Notes and Editorial Comments

THE COOPERATIVE STUDY MARCHES ON

ELSEWHERE IN THIS ISSUE is reproduced the *Cooperative Study of Secondary-School Standards After Twenty-one Years*, an address given by Carl A. Jessen before the Nineteenth Educational Conference held in 1954 under the auspices of the Educational Records Bureau and the American Council on Education. This brief account of the present status and philosophy of the Cooperative Study, as it is now referred to, originally appeared in *Education in a Free World*, a report of the Conference published by the American Council on Education. It appears in this issue of THE QUARTERLY by permission of the Council.

The concentric circles of the stone cast by the North Central Association in 1933 have since spread to the farthest waters of secondary education. The reader will sense an element of surprise at "the enormous potential" which Mr. Jessen touches upon at one point in the treatment of his subject. Thus even those who have been identified with the Cooperative Study since its inception confessedly did not foresee the present potency of their labors. None but Mr. Jessen is in such an advantageous position to express surprise: he has been the secretary of the Study from its beginning.

For the same reason, only Mr. Jessen could have made the address in ques-

tion. It swings along in non-technical style. He handles an essentially ponderous subject with a light touch, a feature which readers of professional matter will appreciate. Perhaps as a related effect, he reveals the implicit romance of the Study.

In THE QUARTERLY for October, 1954, *Early Beginnings of the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards*, by George E. Carrothers, appeared. This article has basic historical value because Mr. Carrothers, as chairman for approximately fifteen of the twenty-one years treated by Mr. Jessen, was a key figure in the Study. It is here suggested that the reader turn again to what Mr. Carrothers had to say about persons and events identified with that enterprise. The Carrothers-Jessen accounts are complementary.

HARLAN C. KOCH

THE NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF STATE CHAIRMEN

'WAY BACK IN 1938, or thereabouts, when the present editor of THE QUARTERLY was chairman of the Michigan State Committee, that committee in common with all the others was badly undernourished by the penurious crumbs which fell to them from the general financial table. To the shocked surprise of the Scotch guardian of the Association treasury, he led a quiet revolt of his fellow chairmen against the

fifty-dollar-or-so annual gratuity to "cover" their year's activities. Those were the days when the Association's budget was small and "the surplus"—always mentioned in reverent tones—was large; indeed, it was felt that if it ever fell below \$20,000 the Association was headed for the rocks. Seventeen years ago the N.C.A. had not hit its present dynamic pace; hence the agitation of the treasurer over the threatened "raids."

The chairmen had agreed upon a simple formula which would net a flat grant of a hundred dollars or so to those with few schools and fifty cents a school to the others. This the Association authorized and the State Committees took on a measure of animation as a consequence of that action. Ever since, this writer has fancied that "the little revolt of 1938" was the forerunner of the liberalized policy under which State Committees now operate.

With adequate funds (they largely determine the amount themselves) the Committees do vastly effective things, including the holding of the annual work-sessions. On October 2-5, the ninth meeting was held at the University of Colorado. "Steve" Romine, chairman for Colorado, did a typically "Stevian" job as host to his fellow chairmen and the other representatives who had been asked to attend. A full report of this meeting will appear in a later number of *THE QUARTERLY*. The discussions were indeed newsworthy.

In 1956, Indiana University will be the host institution to the tenth convocation. In the absence of Chairman Carl Franzen, on leave in Thailand, "Chris" Jung, acting chairman for Indiana, extended the invitation.

HARLAN C. KOCH

NEW REGULATIONS GOVERNING
APPEALS FROM DECISIONS OF COM-
MISSIONS

ACCORDING TO THE CONSTITUTION OF

the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, paragraphs 3 and 4 of Section 3 of Article IV, "The Executive Committee shall have final authority to hear appeals from the decisions of the Commissions relative to the approval of universities, colleges and secondary schools and to determine the action to be taken upon such appeals." In order to establish a definite procedure in cases of appeal, the following regulations have been adopted by the Executive Committee.

a. Appeals from the decisions of the Commissions shall be filed with the Secretary of the Association not sooner than ten days and not more than thirty days following the close of the Annual Meeting, and such appeals shall represent official action of the governing bodies of the institutions concerned. The basis for such appeals shall be alleged departure from established procedures, bias, injustice, or the presentation of evidence, not originally offered, of the situation of the institution at the time of the original consideration of the membership of the institution. *Evidence of changes, in the operation of the institution, made after the original consideration of membership by the Commission shall not be part of an appeal.* Appeals shall be supported by evidence submitted by the appealing institution in writing. The action of the Executive Committee is restricted to the consideration of allegations of departure from established procedures, bias or injustice, or of evidence not originally submitted, and does not include a reconsideration of the quality of the institution.

b. The appeal and supporting evidence shall be submitted by the Secretary of the Association to the governing body of the Commission concerned.

c. The governing body of the Commission concerned shall consider the appeal and the attached evidence, and shall send its recommendation and the evidence to the Executive Committee.

d. The Executive Committee shall consider the report of the Commission, shall hear representatives of the appealing institution if the Executive Committee so decides, and shall make a final decision concerning the appeal.

PLANS FOR A STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL
SOCIAL EXPERIENCES AND ORGANI-
ZATIONS

THE COMMISSION ON RESEARCH AND
SERVICE submitted the following re-

port to the Executive Committee of the Association at its summer meeting in Chicago. As the reader will see, the report traces the emergence of plans for the study of a most important aspect of secondary-school life. Now that efforts to do something constructive about athletics have been brought to fruition (THE QUARTERLY for April, 1955), problems implicit in other types of activities are quietly engaging the attention of properly commissioned bodies within the Association. The perennial character of some of these problems most high school principals will recognize in the following paragraphs. EDITOR.

*Committee on Social Experiences
and Organizations*

At the annual North Central meeting in 1950 a group discussion was held on problems relating to high school fraternities and sororities. As a result of this group discussion, and in light of the apparent interest in this problem, a subcommittee was established to make a preliminary study. The discussion group felt that there were serious problems in this area and that it would be worthwhile for the North Central Association to make some study of them.

The subcommittee of which B. L. Shepherd, assistant superintendent of Secondary Education, Tulsa, Oklahoma, is chairman, made a preliminary survey to determine the interest on the part of the principals to participate in a study of the problems relating to high school fraternities and sororities. The result of this survey indicated that very few principals were interested in becoming "involved" in a study of high school fraternities and sororities as such.

At the 1951 annual meeting a group of forty-five principals discussed the problem again and requested that a committee be appointed to make fur-

ther investigations of the general problem of social experiences and organizations. The committee was appointed and charged with the responsibility of developing a plan which would assist secondary schools in examining organizations which provide social experiences and activities for high school youth. In carrying out this assignment the committee developed a statement defining social organizations together with some guiding principles and criteria for evaluating these organizations. To aid in implementing the application of these principles to situations in local schools the committee developed a check sheet to be used by faculty study groups for examining their organizations in light of the basic criteria as defined by the committee. A student activities participation inventory sheet and a check list for use by the principal in evaluating the activities program of the school were developed.

These materials were submitted to sixty-five schools for examination and possible use as a pilot study. Forty of the schools used the materials in a preliminary study and reported their evaluation of them. An analysis of the appraisal of the materials by the high school principals and their faculties indicated that the statement defining organizations that provide social experiences, along with the statements of guiding principles and basic criteria which might be used for evaluation, were well accepted because they made significant contribution to the local school faculty in assisting in studying their activity program and in identifying problems.

It seems apparent from the number of schools that responded as pilot schools in the study that there is a fairly high degree of interest on the part of secondary school personnel in the studying and evaluating of organizations which provide social ex-

periences for high school youth. The report of the use of the student activities participation inventory revealed that there is a wide range between excess and no participation of high school students. This suggested to the faculties the need for further study of the local school program. The activities participation inventory also provided an opportunity for involving parents and students in studying the program of the school.

The number of responses from the preliminary study indicated that the use of the check sheet on basic criteria by faculties in the study of their local organizations which provided social experiences gave faculty sponsors new insights into the relationship of their particular organization to the total educational program and the extent to which that organization functioned in harmony with good educational practice. The responses from the preliminary study also indicated that this material provided another good avenue for cooperation of faculty members in working on common school problems.

The committee felt that from this preliminary study the materials developed might be readily adapted and made available to North Central schools for the purpose of local study. Such a study could provide the total faculty with new insights into the relationship of organizations, both inside and outside the school, toward the total educational program. Such a study would have many ramifications as to the place of school sponsored organizations as well as organizations which have their origin outside the school but which involve the social life of the school.

STICKING TO OUR OWN KNITTING

ON SATURDAY, June 25, 1955, at its summer meeting, the Executive Com-

mittee of the Association adopted the following motion:

That the Executive Committee of the North Central Association instruct the Department of Defense Committee to inform the appropriate officials of the Fifth Army Headquarters that it will be inadvisable for the North Central Association to participate in the tour of the Armed Forces installations which was proposed at the meeting Wednesday, June 8, 1955 at the Fifth Army Headquarters at Chicago.

The Association has taken this action because it is fully committed to the implementation of the unit of study entitled *Your Life Plans and the Armed Forces* in accordance with the carefully drawn plans which were agreed to by the Department of Defense, the American Council on Education, and the North Central Association and because such participation would obscure the fundamental educational purpose of the unit of study just referred to.

The proposed tour was not identified in any way with the plans which eventuated in the publication of *Your Life Plans and the Armed Forces* but originated in interests extraneous to them; hence the action reported above. Any reader who is interested in refreshing his memory about the magnitude of the task represented by *Your Life Plans and the Armed Forces* may do so by referring specifically to THE QUARTERLY for October, 1954 (p. 151) and April, 1955 (p. 319). By the time this appears in print, each of approximately 25,000 high schools should have received a copy of this basic publication in advance of its availability.

So important is this volume that THE QUARTERLY is pleased to print the following announcement in its entirety. It was released by the American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., the publishers of *Your Life Plans and the Armed Forces*.

Every senior high school will receive late in October a free copy of *Your Life Plans and the Armed Forces* and its *Teachers Handbook*.

These two books make up a unit of study designed to assist high school youth in making adequate and realistic plans for their futures, to

inform them of the choices open to them in fulfilling their probable military obligations, and to describe the opportunities for continuing their education while in service.

This unit of study was prepared by a special committee of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools with the cooperation of many regional and national educational associations and agencies. The material was tried out in a number of schools and reviewed by curriculum and guidance experts before publication. A copy of the unit will be sent to all senior secondary schools by the publisher in cooperation with the National Association of Secondary-School Principals with funds furnished by the Office of Armed Forces Information and Education, Department of Defense.

Your Life Plans and the Armed Forces will be an attractively illustrated combined text-and-workbook of 160 pages in large format, $8\frac{1}{2} \times 11$, paper-covered. The publisher, the American Council on Education, will have copies of the text and the *Teachers Handbook* for sale for class use.

The student is aided in making plans for his future by analyzing his own interests, abilities, and values by means of an "Inventory and Data Sheet," "Vocational Summary Chart," and a "Career Chart."

Military obligations and options—including the recently amended Reserve program—are clearly set out so the students may be aware of the choices available to them.

The book gives a complete description of the many opportunities for continuing education and training while in the Armed Forces. The text brings together in one volume for the first time, educational offerings in the Air Force, Army, and

Coast Guard, Marine Corps, and Navy, as well as the U. S. Armed Forces Institute.

Your Life Plans and the Armed Forces was prepared under the direction of the Defense Committee of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Members were:

Lowell B. Fisher, University of Illinois, Urbana, *Chairman*

Frank H. Byers, University of Illinois, Urbana, *Assistant to the Chairman*

George A. Beck, Principal, Central High School, Duluth, Minnesota

Norman Burns, University of Chicago, Chicago

J. Fred Murphy, Principal, Broad Ripple High School, Indianapolis, Indiana

Ernest Whitworth, Commission on Accreditation of Service Experiences, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.

Cooperating associations and agencies were:

American Personnel and Guidance Association

Council of Chief State School Officers

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

National Catholic Educational Association

New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools

Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Western College Association

Your Life Plans and the Armed Forces. 160 pages, $8\frac{1}{2} \times 11$. Paper \$2.00.

Teachers Handbook. 32 pages. \$0.60.

YOUR LIFE PLANS AND THE ARMED FORCES

CONTENTS

PART I

YOUR OPPORTUNITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN LIFE

CHAPTER I. YOUR COUNTRY

The Struggle Is Complex; Your Rights, Freedoms, and Privileges; Your Responsibilities in Our Democracy; Your Part in the Struggle

CHAPTER II. YOUR LIFE PLANS

Your Perspective; Choosing Your Career Is a Complicated Task; The Occupational Outlook Handbook List; Most Jobs Require Many Skills; Military Service as a Career; You Must Consider Your Values; Match Your Abilities and Values with the Requirements of the Occupations You Are Considering; Further Training is Essential; How To Reach Your Goals

CHAPTER III. VOCATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES IN THE MILITARY SERVICE

How Military Service Can Contribute to Your Life Plans; Opportunities for Advancement; Opportunities for Organized Off-Duty Education; The USAFI Educational Programs; High School and Vocational-Technical School Level Programs; College and University Level Work; Coast Guard and

Marine Corps Institutes; Self-Improvement on the Job; Army Occupations—Related Civilian Jobs; Naval Occupations—Related Civilian Jobs; Air Force Occupations—Related Civilian Jobs; Marine Corps Occupations—Related Civilian Jobs; Coast Guard Occupations—Related Civilian Jobs

CHAPTER IV. WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

General Qualifications and Conditions; Women's Army Corps (WAC); Women in the Air Force (WAF); Women in the Navy (WAVE); Women in the Marine Corps; Military Nursing; Women's Medical Specialist Corps

CHAPTER V. MILITARY OBLIGATIONS AND OPTIONS

Obligations; Options; Selective Service; Enlistment; Reserve Components; The United States Military, Naval, Coast Guard, and Air Force Academies; Reserve Officers Training Corps; Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class; Officer Candidate Schools and Courses; Medical, Dental, and Clergy Training Programs; Direct Appointment from Civilian Life; Branches of the Service You May Enter; In Conclusion

PART II

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

CHAPTER VI. EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE THROUGH THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES INSTITUTE

The USAFI Educational Program

Curriculum; Selection of Courses; Instructional Plans Used by USAFI

Testing and Accreditation Services—USAFI

Testing Services; Accreditation

The USAFI Catalog

USAFI Courses and Major Occupational Groups

Major Occupation Groups and Industries; Major Groups Available USAFI Subject Areas;

USAFI and Major Occupational Fields in the Service

Special Aids for Service Personnel

CHAPTER VII. EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO AIR FORCE PERSONNEL

Military and Non-military Education Compared

Educational Programs Available to Air Force Personnel

Military Educational Programs in the Air Force; Testing Program; Basic Military Training; On-the-Job Training; Technical Training; "Operation Midnight Oil"; The United States Air Force Academy; The Air University; Opportunities for a Commission

Civilian Education Program in the Air Force, "Operation Bootstrap"

Civilian School Program; Tuition Aid Program; Final Semester Temporary Duty (TDY) Program; The United States Armed Forces Institute; Oversea Program; Obtaining Information Concerning Educational Opportunities

Civilian Education in Relation to Air Force Careers

Career Fields—Air Force; Contributions of Civilian Training to Air Force Careers; Contribution of Air Force Careers to Civilian Careers

CHAPTER VIII. EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO ARMY PERSONNEL

Military and Nonmilitary Education Compared

Educational Programs Available to Army Personnel

Military (on-duty) Educational Programs

On-the-Job Training; Training at Army Service Schools; Reserve Officers Training Corps (ROTC); Army Officer Candidate Course; Education as Warrant Officers; Women's Army Corps (WAC); Education in the Army Nurse Corps; Women's Medical Specialist Corps; Army Extension Courses

The Troop Education Program

The United States Armed Forces Institute; Group Study Courses; Work at Civilian Institutions; Correspondence Courses Offered by Civilian Institutions; Obtaining Information Concerning Educational Opportunities; Tuition Aid Program

Civilian Education in Relation to Army Careers

Occupational Areas—Army; Contribution of Civilian Training to Army Careers; Contribution of Army Careers to Civilian Careers

CHAPTER IX. EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO COAST GUARD PERSONNEL

Educational Programs Available to Coast Guard Personnel

Educational Programs for Coast Guard Operation

Recruit Training; On-the-Job Training; Advanced (or specialist) Training; Commissioned Officer Training; United States Coast Guard Officer Candidate Course; United States Coast Guard Officer Indoctrination School; The United States Coast Guard Institute

Civilian Education Program

Civilian Education in Relation to Coast Guard Work

Contribution of Civilian Training to Coast Guard Asssignments; Contribution of Coast Guard Training to Civilian Careers

CHAPTER X. EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL

Military and Nonmilitary Education Compared

Military (on-duty) Educational Program Available to Marine Corps Personnel

Educational Programs—Enlisted Men; Educational Programs—Officers and Officer Candidates; Women in the Marine Corps; Extension Schools

Civilian (off-duty) Education Program in the Marine Corps

Marine Corps Institute (MCI); The United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI); Tuition Aid Program

Civilian (pre-service) Education in Relation to Marine Corps Work

Marine Corps Occupation Fields (MOS); Contribution of Civilian Training to Marine Corps Work; Contribution of Marine Corps Education to Civilian Careers

CHAPTER XI. EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO NAVY PERSONNEL

Military and Nonmilitary Education Compared

Military (on-duty) Educational Programs Available to Navy Personnel

Educational Programs

Bureau Responsibility for Naval Education and Training; Occupational or Career Fields; Recruit Training; Rate Training; Functional Training; Operational Training; Shipboard Training; Technical Schools

Educational Opportunities—Officer Candidate

The United States Naval Academy, Annapolis; Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps (NROTC); Officer Candidate School (OCS); Reserve Officer Candidate Program (ROC); Naval Aviation Cadet Program (NAVCAD)

Educational Programs—Officer Training

The Line Officer's Career; Officer Training School and Courses; Bureau of Medicine and Surgery

Women in the Service (WAVES)

Correspondence Courses—Navy

United States Naval Reserve

Civilian Educational Programs (off-duty) Available to Naval Personnel

Civilian (in-service) Education in Relation to Navy Careers

Navy Career Fields; Contribution of Navy Training to Civilian Careers; Contribution of Civilian Education to Navy Careers

BIBLIOGRAPHY

LET'S HAVE A WIDER AUDIENCE FOR
THE LIBERAL ARTS STUDY

WHAT HAS PROVED to be one of the most significant commissions ever awarded by the Association was accepted in 1938 by the newly-created Subcommittee on Liberal Arts Education. Subcommittees come and then go as their activities come full circle. The

fact that this one is seventeen years old and still going strongly indicates that it gains nourishment from its labors. It reports only indirectly to the Association through the parent body, the Commission on Research and Service. This is regrettable, because the secondary-school members certainly have an equity in the Study conducted by this Subcommittee—the colleges

look to the secondary schools for students—and should be kept fully informed about it. To reach the nearly six thousand readers of THE QUARTERLY, including the 3,343 high schools on its mailing list, the following account is re-printed from Volume XV, No. 1, of the *North Central News Bulletin*, a mimeographed house-organ and the excellent voice of the Subcommittee. This account was prepared by Lewis B. Mayhew, of Michigan State University, director of the Study, for the October issue of the *Bulletin*.—
EDITOR.

THE NORTH CENTRAL STUDY OF LIBERAL
ARTS EDUCATION

From time to time it is well for any organization to review its purposes and to appraise itself or at least make explicit what it is doing in the light of those purposes. To help the readers of the *News Bulletin* refresh themselves about the NCA Study of Liberal Arts Education and to help the director and coordinators re-orient themselves a summary of the Study may be in order.

In 1938 the North Central Association created a committee to study the subject of secondary school teachers. Out of the report of this committee came the impetus to inquire still further into the problems of teacher education as it related to the total programs of liberal arts colleges. Ten week-end conferences summarizing the results of this investigation resulted in creating a project or study by which liberal arts colleges could focus attention on whichever of their educational problems seemed most pressing. Through such intensive study it was hoped that improvement of the total program would become a concomitant of improvement of the teacher training aspects.

The Study, which was initiated with a conference at the University of Minnesota in 1941, was, and continues to be, sponsored by the Commission on Research and Service of the North Central Association. This Commission, one of the three policy making groups of the Association, *has never concerned itself with matters of accreditation*. Such matters are the province either of the Commission on Secondary Schools or the Commission on Colleges and Universities. Rather the Commission on Research and Service Aids, through its committees, work groups and projects, assists institutions to improve their own programs.

The purposes of the Study clearly reflect the service orientation of its parent organization.

(1) To provide an opportunity for voluntary inter-institutional cooperation among liberal arts colleges.

(2) To encourage and assist member colleges to organize and execute self-studies.

(3) To sponsor institutional research designed for improvement in programs and teaching in the member colleges.

(4) To facilitate fact-finding and inquiry as methods of program planning and curricular and administrative revision.

(5) To provide continuing stimulation to participating institutions, and indirectly to non-member colleges through inter-collegiate regional conferences.

(6) To provide a consultant service to member and non-member institutions.

(7) To organize and conduct regional conferences on problems in higher education for college teachers who ordinarily attend meetings only in their professional fields.

(8) To provide opportunities for in-service development of liberal arts college teachers.

Through the years the Study has been supported in part by foundation grants but principally by the schools engaged in the project. At the present time the \$200.00 annual fee defrays almost the entire cost of the operations which are conducted through a part-time director and six coordinators who perform their duties without release from their institutions. Such a structure was evolved to provide the kinds of services requested by participating schools. These are:

1. *Workshops in Higher Education*

To provide leadership, resources and leisure necessary for college teachers to concentrate on some problem of higher education of concern to them and their institution and to provide means for participants to consider the problems of education more broadly than is possible during the academic year.

2. *Presidents' Workshop*

To provide a similar kind of experience for college presidents.

3. *Central Office*

The central office of the Study is located in East Lansing, Michigan, and consists of a part-time director and a part-time secretary. This office attempts to coordinate the various Study activities, maintains the files of the project, seeks to provide leadership for new ventures and issues the *News Bulletin* during the academic year.

4. *Coordinators*

To provide the consultant help in a one day visit and serve as the liaison between the schools they visit and the central office of the Study.

5. The North Central *News Bulletin*

Once each month during the academic year the *News Bulletin* is published containing news items, descriptions of studies in progress, reports about new developments in higher education and statements designed to stimulate thought.

6. North Central Packets

Accompanying the *News Bulletin* each month is a collection of bulletins, reprints and other materials likely to be of some significance to teachers in liberal arts colleges.

7. Library and Resource Files

A collection of books and pamphlet materials dealing with problems of higher education is maintained. Items from this collection are available on loan to any one involved in the Study. The entire file and library is used in each workshop.

8. Regional Conferences

The North Central Study cooperates with various regional groups in sponsoring conferences on higher education.

9. Research

The Study is just now entering a venture of sponsoring cooperative research on a regional basis.

The Study always has been under the direction of its member schools. Operating on the precepts of local autonomy, faculty evolution, institutional cooperation, and broad interpretation of educational problems, it has achieved whatever it has in the way of success because its constituent faculties have utilized the Study as a method for self-improvement.

NEW COMMITTEE TO EXECUTE PLANS GOVERNING ATHLETICS

THE COMMISSION ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES has authorized the appointment of a new committee to execute the controlling principles formulated by the former Committee on Athletics and adopted by the Association. The final report of the Committee was reported in full in THE QUARTERLY for April, 1955. Ralph Aigler, professor emeritus of Law at the University of Michigan and chairman of the former Committee will be the chairman of the new committee. It will be remembered that for more than thirty years Mr. Aigler was a recognized authority in the councils of

the "Big Ten." The remaining members of the foregoing committee will be announced later.

This committee has been authorized under the following provisions (Part II of the final report mentioned above):

1. That a standing committee of the Commission on Colleges and Universities be set up to interpret and administer the Association's policy on intercollegiate athletics, and to prepare a schedule of penalties to be applied in cases of violation;

2. That the Committee be composed of five persons appointed by the Chairman of the Commission on Colleges and Universities with the advice of the Commission and subject to the approval of the Executive Committee of the Association. The Committee would report to the Commission at the Annual Meeting and to the Board of Review, acting for the Commission, at such times as might be necessary between Annual Meetings;

3. That the Committee develop working relationships with the athletic conferences and the National Collegiate Athletic Association looking toward the utilization of the resources and machinery of these organizations in the enforcement of appropriate standards for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics;

4. That the Committee develop procedures for dealing with member higher institutions of the Association that are not members of an athletic conference;

5. That the Committee devise and recommend to the Commission appropriate reporting procedures for the member higher institutions of the Association and the athletic conferences in the area of intercollegiate athletics;

6. That the Committee establish and maintain liaison with the other regional accrediting associations with a view to promoting inter-association cooperation in the establishment and

enforcement of standards for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics;

7. That, in the event of the failure of an athletic organization to secure conformity by a member higher institution to standards considered appropriate by the North Central Association, the Committee intervene and, after proper investigation, recommend penalties to the Commission on Colleges and Universities.

COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDY
IN EDUCATION

ELSEWHERE IN THIS ISSUE appears an article entitled "The Role of Graduate Schools in Teacher Education: A Study of Ten Graduate Programs," by R. W. McCulloch, of Western State College of Colorado. Although Mr. McCulloch's study was not made under the auspices of the North Central Association, the institutions represented are situated in North Central territory; hence the appearance of his report in *THE QUARTERLY*.

Both members and administrators of academic faculties rather continually express their concern over the growth of professional education and the pattern which it represents; but both pattern and standards have not yet eluded the attention of responsible minds within the professional field—certainly not that of the Commission on Colleges and Universities. The latest evidence of that fact is the relatively recent appointment of the Committee on Graduate Study in Education. These are the members:

WILLIAM R. ROSS, President, Colorado State College of Education, Greeley, Colorado (Chairman)

DONALD P. COTTRELL, Dean, College of Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

HARVEY H. DAVIS, Provost, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

JOHN R. EMENS, President, Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana

CHARLES J. TURCK, President, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota

The Committee is actively executing its commission.

INTEREST IN HIGH SCHOOL-COLLEGE
ARTICULATION CONTINUES

IN JUNE, 1955, the Committee on High School-College Articulation, a committee of the Commission on Research and Service, reported that it is giving attention to such problems as these:

1. The adjustment problems of college students.
2. Curriculum coordination between secondary schools and colleges.
3. Identification and assessments of the competencies needed by students for success in college.
4. Methods of identifying gifted students and stimulating them.
5. Clarification of the responsibilities and functions of secondary schools and colleges in providing for the "rising tide of enrollments," in the next few years.
6. Promoting the flow of information both ways between secondary schools and colleges.

The mounting numbers of students in both high school and college, with the peak enrollment in the undiscernible future, give relevance to the foregoing topics. Mr. Clyde Vromen, Director of Admissions, University of Michigan, is chairman of the above committee.

**A SIGNIFICANT ANNUAL EVENT
IN ILLINOIS**

AMONG THOSE who are acquainted with Lowell B. Fisher, state chairman for Illinois and otherwise a prominent figure in the Association, his relations to his constituency are known to be unusually effective. That his task of keeping that constituency well-advised in a state in which more secondary schools are accredited by the Association than in any other—there are 521—is a challenging responsibility, is widely

recognized. One of the means which Lowell and the other members of the State Committee employ is to hold a much-more-than-routine fall meeting. The character of this meeting is shown by the program below. True, meetings

of this type are not unique in Illinois; but the general excellence of the convocation held there this year has prompted the printing of the complete program in this department of THE QUARTERLY.—EDITOR.

PROGRAM

THE FOURTH ANNUAL MEETING

THE ILLINOIS STATE COMMITTEE OF THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Tuesday, October 4, 1955

Lincoln Hall Theatre

University of Illinois, Urbana

Morning Program

Presiding: C. C. Byerly, *First Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Member of the Illinois State Committee*

9:30 Greetings—Dean B. L. Dodds, *College of Education, University of Illinois*

9:45 "Your Life Plans and the Armed Forces," A Unit of Study—Lowell B. Fisher, *State Chairman*
10:15 A Look at High School Extra-Curricular Activities—Eugene Youngert, *Superintendent, Oak Park-River Forest High School, Oak Park*

11:00 Principles for Inter-Collegiate Athletics: How Secondary School Administrators Can Help—
Dean Robert B. Browne, *University Extension and Summer Session, and Chairman of the University Senate Committee on Athletics, University of Illinois*

Luncheon Program

12:00 Noon, Illini Union Ball Room

Presiding: Lowell B. Fisher, *State Chairman*

Presentation of Special Guests

"Welcome"—President David Dodds Henry, *University of Illinois*

"The White House Conference on Education"

In Illinois—Vernon L. Heath, *Chairman, Illinois Planning Committee, Robinson*

In Washington—Roderick McPhee, *Field Representative, White House Conference, Madison, Wisconsin*

(Both speakers will be introduced by Vernon L. Nickell, *Superintendent of Public Instruction, Springfield*)

Music during the luncheon provided by Levin Cummins at the Hammond Organ.

"Hail to the Orange"—led by Verrollton Shaul, *Director of Music, Champaign Senior High School*

FOURTH ANNUAL ILLINOIS NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION LUNCHEON

12:00 Noon, Tuesday, October 4, 1955

Illini Union Ball Room

University of Illinois, Urbana

Guests at Speakers' Table

Vernon L. Nickell, *Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois*

David D. Henry, *President, University of Illinois*

Henning Larsen, *Provost, University of Illinois*

Robert B. Browne, *Dean, University Extension and the Summer Session, and Chairman, University Senate Committee on Athletics, University of Illinois*

George P. Tuttle, *Director of Admissions, University of Illinois*

B. L. Dodds, *Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois*

C. W. Sanford, *Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois*

Vernon Heath, *Chairman, Illinois Planning Committee, Robinson*

Roderick McPhee, *Field Representative, White House Conference, Madison, Wisconsin*

Robert G. Buzzard, *President, Eastern Illinois State College, Charleston*
 Harold P. Rodes, *President, Bradley University, Peoria*
 D. G. Ryan, *Chairman, Committee on Admissions from Secondary Schools, University of Illinois*
 Eric Johnson, *Chairman, Illinois Curriculum Program, University of Illinois*
 C. C. Byerly, *First Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Illinois*
 Robert Cole, *Executive Secretary, Illinois School Board Association, Springfield*
 Irving Pearson, *Executive Secretary, Illinois Education Association, Springfield*
 Al Willis, *Executive Secretary, Illinois High School Association, Chicago*
 J. A. Mason, *President, Illinois Association of School Administrators, Skokie*
 George Olsen, *President, Illinois Secondary School Principals Association, LaGrange*
 Benjamin Willis, *General Superintendent of Schools, Chicago*
 Frank Bills, *Superintendent of Schools, Peoria*
 Byron Fulk, *Division of University Extension, University of Illinois*
 Lowell B. Fisher, *Chairman, Illinois State Committee, North Central Association, University of Illinois*

Members of Illinois State Committee

H. L. Richards, <i>Blue Island</i>	Mrs. H. M. Mulberry, <i>Chicago</i>
E. S. Simmonds, <i>Morrison</i>	Joseph Ackerman, <i>Elmhurst</i>
R. H. Sanders, <i>Chicago</i>	Carl Maxwell, <i>Washington</i>
Father Raymond T. Grant, <i>Chicago</i>	W. C. Jacquin, <i>Peoria</i>
Arthur Milward, <i>Mt. Vernon</i>	Reinhard Wilson, <i>Centralia</i>

Verrollton Shaul, *Director of Music, Champaign Senior High School, Champaign*

REPRESENTATIVES TO THE ANNUAL
 MEETINGS OF OTHER REGIONAL
 ASSOCIATIONS

THE EXCHANGE of so-called "fraternal delegates" by the various regional associations is a long-standing practice. It is an established custom to hand the keys to these delegates so that they may observe anything that interests them at the sessions which they attend. That this exchange of observers is profitable all around need not be argued. The following individuals have been appointed to represent the North Central Association at the respective annual meetings indicated below:

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlantic City, New Jersey, November 25-26, 1955: *J. E. Stonecipher*.

New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Boston, Massachusetts, December 8-10, 1955: *Edgar G. Johnston*.

Northwest Association of Secondary and Higher Schools, Spokane, Washington, November 14-16, 1955: *Clarence I. Pontius*.

Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Miami Beach, Florida, November 28-December 1, 1955: *Harlan C. Koch*.
 Western College Association, San Francisco,

California, November 11-12, 1955: *P. M. Bail*.
 Alternate Delegates: *Tom L. Popejoy, Richard A. Harvill*.

J. E. Stonecipher is president of the North Central Association and director of Secondary Education for the schools of Des Moines, Iowa; *Edgar G. Johnston* is immediate past-president of the Association and professor of Secondary Education at Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan; *Clarence I. Pontius* is a member of the Executive Committee of the Association and president of Tulsa University, Tulsa, Oklahoma; *Harlan C. Koch* is editor of THE QUARTERLY and assistant dean of the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; *P. M. Bail* is a past-president of the North Central Association and president of the University of Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska; *Tom L. Popejoy* is a member of the Commission on Colleges and Universities and president of the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque; and *Richard A. Harvill* is president of the University of Arizona, Tucson.

VISITORS TO THE AMERICAN DEPENDENTS' SCHOOLS

THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE of the Commission on Secondary Schools has appointed the following individuals as visitors to the Dependents' Schools for 1955-56.

Europe: *Floyd A. Miller* and *George A. Beck*

Far East: *E. H. Fixley* and *Stephen A. Romine*

Puerto Rico: *Richard K. Klein* and *Floyd A. Simmons*

FLOYD A. MILLER is chairman of the Commission on Secondary Schools and a member of the staff of the Nebraska State Department of Education; GEORGE A. BECK is a member of the Executive Committee of the Association and principal of the Central High School, Duluth, Minnesota; E. H. FIXLEY is chairman of the New Mexico State Committee and professor of School Administration at the University of New Mexico; STEPHEN A. ROMINE is chairman of the Colorado State Committee and professor of Secondary Education at the University of Colorado; RICHARD K. KLEIN is chairman of the North Dakota State Committee and a member of the State Department of Education; FLOYD A. SIMMONS is a member of the Cooperating Committee on Research of the Commission on Secondary Schools and principal of East High School, Cleveland, Ohio.

These visits will be made at the expense of the Armed Forces. In character and function they correspond to visits by members of the various State Committees to their member schools. It will be recalled that the Dependents' Schools are maintained by the federal government for the children of members of the Armed Forces at foreign posts. The North Central Association,

by agreement, is the sole accrediting agency. Thirty-four such schools are on the 1955-56 roster of the Association.

PUBLIC SCHOOL GRADUATES
MAKE GOOD

IF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY is any criterion, public high school graduates do better in college than students from private schools.

A recent study by the Princeton University Counseling Service found that the 244 public high school graduates in the survey group earned higher grades, on the average, than did the 398 private school alumni. The researchers used a scholastic aptitude test which enabled them to measure ability and to take that factor into account in their comparisons.

A similar survey was made among sophomores and here again public school graduates were found to earn higher grades than private school graduates of equal ability.

The investigators interpret their findings this way: At the freshman level, public school graduates have a stronger drive to make good. However, at the sophomore level, motivational factors cannot entirely explain the results. Probably, public school students have not been taught skills of organization and criticism to the same extent as have the private school graduates. If this is true, then public school alumni have more to learn in this respect from their work in their freshman year, and the results of such gains may appear in their superior performance at the sophomore level.

In any case, the results of the survey would seem to put to rest the common belief that public school graduates are handicapped in college by comparison with students from private schools.—*The Edpress News*

FEDERAL BULLETIN ANALYZES
ACCREDITATION OF HIGH SCHOOLS
IN THE SEVERAL STATES

IN THE BELIEF that many readers of THE QUARTERLY may not have seen "State Accreditation of High Schools—Practices and Standards of State Agencies," issued as *Bulletin 1955, No. 5* by the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, mention is made here of its availability at thirty cents from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. The following paragraph appears in the Foreword:

A major study of State standards of accreditation has not been made by the Office of Education for more than 20 years. It was thought, therefore, that a comprehensive survey of such standards at this time would be helpful to State boards of education and State departments of education in planning revisions of their standards as well as to students and others interested in school administration. The present study is an attempt to analyze and summarize the standards of accreditation and procedures used in the 48 States.

A helpful bibliography is included.

BYLAWS OF THE COMMISSION ON
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

1. The member colleges and universities of the Association shall be grouped according to the following geographic districts:

District A—Michigan, Ohio, West Virginia

District B—Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana

District C—North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, Iowa

District D—Kansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Arkansas

District E—Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona

2. The member colleges and universities of the Association shall be classified by type. The basis for this classifi-

cation shall be the highest degree offered by an institution. For purposes of inter-institutional communication and discussion of common problems the Commission shall consider petitions for reclassification from institutions which feel that they have a stronger community of interests with some group other than the group in which they would be classified on the basis of highest degree offered. So far as the accredited status of an institution is concerned this opportunity for reclassification would not exist; that is, an institution offering the Master's degree must be accredited as an institution offering the Master's degree and will be judged on the basis of the norms applicable to that type of institution.

Comment.—It is recognized that this basis for classification does not provide for as large a measure of homogeneity within the groups as might be desirable. There were, however, equally serious if not more serious objections to other proposed classifications. Classification by highest degree offered is an important step in the direction of recognizing the several communities of interest which exist within the Association. Perhaps with experience a more meaningful basis for classification can be devised.

3. The members of the Commission on Colleges and Universities shall be selected by district and by type of institution. The Doctor's degree-granting institutions in each of the five districts shall be entitled to two Commissioners for each ten institutions or major fraction thereof but with a minimum of one and a maximum of four Commissioners. The Master's degree-granting institutions, the Bachelor's degree-granting institutions, and the junior colleges in each of the five districts shall be entitled to one Commissioner for each ten institutions or major fraction thereof but with a mini-

mum of one and a maximum of four Commissioners in any one district. The Commissioners shall serve for four-year terms, one-fourth of the terms expiring each year, and shall be ineligible for reelection until one year has elaspsed. At any one time there shall be no more than one Commissioner from any one institution.

The Commissioners in each district shall nominate persons annually to replace those whose terms have expired in accordance with the formula covering the distribution of Commissioners by type of institution within the district. The nominations from the districts shall be submitted to the Nominating Committee for the Commission appointed annually by the Board of Review. The Nominating Committee for the Commission shall present its nominations to the Commission at the time of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Election of the Commissioners shall be by the representatives of the member institutions at the Annual Meeting on recommendation of the Commission.

4. The Commission on Secondary Schools shall designate three members of the Commission on Secondary Schools to serve on the Commission on Colleges and Universities. Secondary School members of the Commission shall serve for four-year terms or until expiration of their terms on the Commission on Secondary Schools, whichever is shorter.

5. The Commissioners representing each of the four types of institutions shall be organized as committees by type of institution. The committees by type of institution shall provide the mechanism through which consideration may be given to matters of particular interest to the different types of institutions. Within the general framework of Commission policies applicable to the entire higher institutional

membership, and subject to Commission approval, these committees shall develop policies relative to the types of institutions they represent. With regard to the accreditation function the committees by type of institution shall serve as preliminary reviewing committees for the Board of Review. At the time of the Annual Meeting when actions on the accredited status of institutions are taken, each of the committees by type of institution shall act on the cases of institutions of its type. The action of the committee shall be in the form of a recommendation to the Board of Review based on the report of the examiners, the self-survey report, an interview with the president of the institution, and discussion of the situation with the chairman of the examining team. This procedure shall be followed both for newly-applying institutions and for member institutions whose accredited status is under consideration.

The committees by type of institution shall meet at the time of the Annual Meeting of the Association. The normal expectation is that the expenses of Commissioners for attendance at the Annual Meeting will be paid by their institutions. Expenses of Commissioners for attendance at meetings of the committees by type held at times other than the time of the Annual Meeting will be paid by the Association.

6. The Commissioners from each of the five geographic districts shall be organized as district committees. District committees shall serve as local agencies of the Commission. As such they will be expected to stand ready to assist both member and non-member higher institutions in various ways, and may, in some instances, take the initiative in establishing contact with institutions faced with serious problems.

An institution seeking accreditation

shall be advised by the Secretary of the Commission to seek the assistance of the district committee in carrying on its self-survey and in making other preparations for examination. It is expected that the district committee will review the self-survey report critically with a view to offering constructive advice on the institution's problems and, where it seems desirable, offer recommendations for strengthening the institution's weaknesses before an examination by the Association is requested. When the self-survey is filed with the Secretary of the Commission it should be accompanied by whatever comments the district committee may care to make. However, the district committee shall have no responsibility for decision-making in the accreditation process; this shall be the responsibility of the committees by type of institution, the Board of Review, and the Commission as a whole.

In addition to its work with individual institutions each district committee shall serve as a unifying force among the higher institutions in its district through the conduct of group meetings, conferences, workshops, and the like for consideration of problems of common interest. It is recommended that each district committee schedule at least one district meeting each year but that the determination of the desirability or need of such meeting be entirely within the discretion of the district committee and the member colleges and universities in the district.

It shall be the responsibility of the district committees to maintain close relationships with the secondary schools of the district through cooperation with the state committees of the Commission on Secondary Schools. One way of maintaining this relationship is to invite one, two, or three of the high school representatives on the state committees to attend the meet-

ings of the district committee.

Each district committee shall elect a chairman and a secretary. The secretary shall make arrangements for meetings and conferences and shall handle the correspondence and other business of the committee. It is to be hoped that in some if not all of the districts a member of the staff of one of the institutions, part of whose time could be freed for this activity, may be given the responsibility for discharging the secretary's duties. Each of the district committees shall be provided with a budget to defray the cost of traveling to institutions within the district and of clerical and administrative activities involved in maintaining the office of the secretary of the committee.

7. The Board of Review of the Commission on Colleges and Universities shall be composed of nine persons elected by the Commission for staggered terms of five years without opportunity for re-election until one year has elapsed. The members of the Board of Review shall be selected with due regard for geographic distribution and institutional type but without specification as to the number from each geographic district or type of institution. If the term of a member of the Board expires before the expiration of his term on the Board he shall continue on the Commission as an added member until the expiration of his term on the Board.

The Secretary of the Commission, elected by the Commission, shall be *ex officio* secretary of the Board of Review. He shall serve for a four-year term and be eligible for re-election. The Secretary shall not be a member of the Board of Review or of the Commission.

8. One person in each member college and university shall be designated the official North Central Association representative. This person shall rep-

resent his institution at the Annual Meetings of the Association and shall be the member of the institutional staff to whom all communications relating to the activities of the Commission on Colleges and Universities will be directed. It is expected that the representative will be the president of the institution or someone designated by the president. In cases where the institutional representative is not the president, communications from the Commission on Colleges and Universities should be directed to both the designated representative and the president.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

CARL A. JESSEN is executive secretary of studies of secondary school standards

in the United States Office of Education and served as secretary of the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards from 1933 to 1951; ROBERT W. McCULLOCH is chairman of graduate studies at Western State College of Colorado, at Gunnison; VICTOR A. RAPPORT is dean of Liberal Arts at Wayne University, at Detroit, Michigan, and is on leave for a calendar year with the American Cultural Exchange Program, at Rome, Italy; NELSON A. SNIDER is principal of South Side High School, at Fort Wayne, Indiana, and treasurer of the Association; and ORDWAY TEAD is an editor of social and economic publications for Harper & Brothers and former chairman of the Board of Higher Education for New York City.

Faculty Freedom: Administratively Viewed¹

YOUR MAJOR THEME "The Challenges to Freedom in Education" is perennially timely.

It has numerous facets. And I select only one or two for elaboration. I shall try to answer these four questions:

- I. What is the problem of faculty freedom in higher education—especially as this is viewed in the public interest of assuring the best possible education?
- II. What is the relation of the students to the integrity of this faculty freedom?
- III. What is a sound administrative view of faculty freedom; is it in any way different from the faculty's own view? And in conclusion,
- IV. What can be done to assure, strengthen, and give full support to the freedom I am urging?

I have been reasonably intimate with the conduct of colleges for more than a quarter century. And I am not too deeply disturbed by the encroachments upon faculty freedom which can obviously be pointed to as having their source in *outside* influences. In the long look, these encroachments seem to be *not* to come importantly from the various kinds of external pressure and interference with which we have become familiar in the last couple of decades. A listing of these would make an imposing and depressing array—all the way from Congressional investigations to the disturbing efforts of earnest groups with neo-fascist ideologies which

can so readily mislead unwary alumni and citizens. But fortunately it is rare that more than one pressure group operates at the same time on the same campus.

And the fact is that all of these outside challenges have been and can again be met by college presidents who have intestinal fortitude and are worthy to be presidents. Annoying and harassing incidents will no doubt recur, but I believe they do not comprise the central issue. And the need seems urgent to be candid as to where the challenges to freedom do in fact most seriously arise.

My thesis is that faculty freedom is threatened by faculty insensitivity about urgent educational problems which are *within* the college, in areas where faculties have reasonable freedom of action. Or to state the issue more bluntly, I ask: Is it not complacency as to established purposes and processes which tends most seriously to inhibit freedom of thought and action; and are not too many faculties so habituated to present ways of conducting the education of a college that they do not freely examine the improvements which may be urgently required?

Our concern does not have to be primarily with faculties being free from restrictive influences, but rather with their boldly assuming freedom *to* and *for* a confronting of the issues presented by today's and tomorrow's higher education as the administration has

¹ Delivered at a meeting of the Commission on Colleges and Universities, March 24, 1955, in Chicago. The theme of the meeting was "The Challenges to Freedom in Education."

necessarily to view them in the public interest. The problem of freedom here is always to be seeking improvement in educational effort and result; and as enrollment pressures become acute to be bold in assuring that quantity does not dilute quality. Eager faculty acceptance of responsibility for fresh and constant scrutiny on behalf of qualitative performance is the crying need.

Indeed, I go further and say that if more of such faculty freedom were affirmatively manifest, there would exist on each campus a mobilized, exhilarating, creative zest and power which would nullify any outside attacks which might on occasion seem to threaten. Our colleges are in a situation where a bold courageous faculty offensive mobilized *from within* would revitalize both the relation of the college to the community and reshape the colleges themselves. We can be eloquent before the public about the college's meaning and purpose only as there is some clarion faculty unity and shared free thought as to what that meaning and that purpose are. And that requires the responsible exercise of faculty freedom to be educators and not mere subject-matter specialists.

I. Faculty Freedom for What.

To clinch my point I would ask my administrative associates a number of questions; and the first and inclusive one is this:

How many of your faculty can you count upon to view and act upon matters of educational objectives, curricular reorganization, teaching methods, and student relations in an objective way with the interest centered upon student growth, institutional integrity, and long-range, qualitative improvement in all areas? In short, how many of your faculty are educators as well as scholars?

Most of the other questions subsume under this one. For example:

When problems of curricular change are raised, how many of your faculty can see dispassionately beyond their subjects, their departments and their own courses, and examine proposed changes on their over-all *educational* merits?

Is department autonomy cherished by its members as sacrosanct and unassailable?

Are administrative efforts to reduce the number of course offerings in the catalog widely resisted?

Do departments tend strongly to keep extending their prerequisites, requirements, and recommended collateral courses for students who are their "majors"?

How many of your faculty manifest genuine concern for a reorientation of the relevant subject matters to a *global* outlook in which the inclusion of non-European data on all aspects of culture is recognized as now indispensable?

Is any systematic attention being paid by faculty members to the improvement of their teaching, looking to a more vital and permanent student learning experience? Or is "classroom knowledge" rather than relevant life knowledge in the ascendant?

Is there any tested faculty knowledge or inquiry as to what subjects and courses should best be taught in small groups, or might with equal effectiveness be carried on in part by good lectures to large groups? Also in this same connection, what is being discovered by faculties themselves about the educational strength and weakness of television instruction, either over a closed circuit or more widely broadcast—all looking to the multiplication of faculty power and influence?

Is there general faculty understand-

ing of the importance of economic motivations among today's students which is capitalized upon in handling those vital liberal and general studies which are essential to making an educated person? Do faculty try to minimize rather than maximize the unhappy liberal versus vocational dichotomies?

Are faculty members concerned with students as *individual persons*—immature, puzzled and growing—or is there little contact of older and younger minds at the level of friendliness and personal solicitude?

I could extend this list. But I trust the point is made that *someone* in the institution has to be concerned that the student's education is being viewed as a whole, that *students* are being taught as well as subjects, that memorized accumulations of raw knowledge are not thought to add up to an education, that the entire process is continuously viewed and reviewed in respect to its ultimate relevance to the competence of young people to live in the contemporary world.

Some will ask what these questions of educational purpose and method have to do with the teacher's freedom. Is not the college administrator at this point himself challenging faculty freedom by injecting such uncomfortable questionings about matters which have been faculty prerogatives a long time?

To which my answer is that of course faculty freedom has to be challenged if it is conceived as *laissez faire*, as uncriticized conformity to traditions of conventional scholarship, as failure to examine objectives in the light of today's world conditions.

Of course there should be perennial faculty questioning of subjects, courses and individual personalities from the point of view of total utility and value for student needs. Otherwise there is slavery to habit.

I would go further and say that where faculty freedom has meant failure to consider the central issues of life with students, it is being abused. If the climate of a campus is permeated with a false "objectivity" and intellectual neutrality, with logical positivism, moral relativism, deterministic scientism, and a completely non-theistic secularism, the student is being denied *his* freedom to examine matters of critical urgency which should be provided by greater stress on philosophy, religion, and the other humanities seen in the context of today's tensions.

What I am saying does not remotely have to do with an administrative authoritarianism in which teachers are to be told what to teach and how to teach it. Such an objection would miss my point altogether. I am saying that faculty freedom means that we should have many more professors influenced freely to assume the responsibility of being teachers who are humanists first and specialists second.

Every profession, including teaching is after all dedicated not to its content *per se*, but to its relation to the advancement of a total human good—in this case the better education of the *whole* young person. The faculty question should be: *How can I educate better*, instead of how can I get more ascendancy for *my* department and *my* subject? That is the question which will be faced by the free teacher; and it will be the sign of his freedom. For it will evidence his willingness to be responsible for a process extending beyond the confines of his own scholarship and beyond his own subject discipline.

Any campus which has a growing proportion of teachers thus free, while of course nourishing their own scholarship, will be an irresistibly strong tower of educational vitality and the gates of all the hells of stupidity, prejudice,

pedantry, laziness, and senility will not prevail against it.

For the focus of what comprises faculty freedom has shifted. The new freedom, desired and expected from a widening public and giving stress to the rightful public interest, is freedom to enrich and ennable the lives of more millions of earnestly seeking young people. And that enrichment requires a rethinking of the purpose and process of higher education, as a growing number of authorities have been saying for well over a decade.

The teacher tended in the past to be the center around which the college revolved. The center has now—and speedily—to get closer to the student and his needs, and to society and its needs.

II. *The Student's Freedom*

The reason for reference here to student freedom is to link it with faculty freedom in an organic way. At bottom the two are the obverse and reverse of the same reality. If freedom "can consist only in the power of doing what we ought to will" (Montesquieu),¹ the student's rights, claims, and obligations deserve more than nominal attention; and this is true without going to any all-out extreme in accepting a doctrine of "student-centered" education.

The modern student is without a doubt far more aware than a generation ago of the seriousness of his educational assignment, and aware also of some of the ways and means toward intellectual growth which he should be privileged to enjoy. And colleges cannot prosper in their rightful fulfillment of function if they ignore these student outlooks because of faculty freedom to do nothing.

¹ Quoted by Walter Lippmann in *The Public Philosophy*, p. 144.

What are some rightful student expectations about purpose, process, and result?

The student today wants to come to grips with all the deep realities and issues of his own troubled time. He asks the stimulus of relevance, of a felt sense of importance—as Whitehead put it—of ideas not "inert" but aglow with meaning, applicable to his living as imaginatively viewed.

He wants to be exposed to and to catch the contagion of the great historic, moral and spiritual ideas. He wants and he needs, in the recent phrase of Walter Lippmann, to identify and affirm the "public philosophy" of civility, decency, honor, virtue, and public responsibility which, as Lippmann eloquently set forth, have recently been in partial eclipse in our society.

He wants (and now I draw upon an admirable recent utterance of the American Council of Learned Societies) to be able to challenge traditional academic thinking as it was embodied in the nineteenth century interpretations of nationalism, democracy, individualism, and religion, all of which stand in need of restatement for contemporary meaning and acceptance.

He wants to have every teacher make clear how each subject and each course relate significantly to him and to his baffling world.

He wants some opportunity to behold the vision of greatness and to be stimulated to the emulation of faculty members, some of whom he can come to know well enough to sense the attractiveness of the life of the mind seriously pursued.

He wants to understand the relation of liberal and vocational studies while not being materialistic or narrow about his own vocational preparation.

He wants to see the economic world in which he will be implicated inter-

preted in its functional and social significance with recognition of the dignity of his role in it, yet at the same time to have it evaluated as to its relative place as an instrumental utility without it being elevated into ultimate sanctity as an all-inclusive be-all and end-all in living.

He wants at once the stimulation, the leisure, and the provocation to use his own mind and feelings for his own exploratory growth—beyond true-false exams and standardized syllabi to be uniformly “covered,” by a spate of instructors and “section-hands.”

The student, in short, is unafraid; he is willing to confront the issues of life and death, of tragedy and sacrifice, if he can but feel deeply what truths lead him to these realities.

Are the colleges unafraid and free to help in this urgent assignment?

III. *The Administrative Role*

The answer to this question brings into focus the relation of the administration to education.

Someone, I repeat, *has* to be deeply concerned with the conduct and the outcomes of each student's college experience *as a whole*. Educational leadership in this situation has to fall upon presidents and deans. The dynamism of creative thought entailed in confronting these problems is thus the charge of all who can rise above the special interest claims which too readily supervene and obstruct desirable action.

The administrative view is continuously encouraging and stimulating the faculty to exercise its freedom *to will* what it ought to will. There is no basic conflict of purpose here, we would like to believe. But there *are* differences of interest and divergencies of outlook, which have to be acknowledged. And ways have to be found to transcend such tensions toward unity of high

purpose and accommodation to necessary changes.

Initiative for finding common grounds of purpose and for implementing the processes of self-examination and alteration—this again is an *administrative* responsibility. For if such initiative does not arise in this quarter, the articulate voice of self-scrutiny either is never heard or is not given influential effect. I submit that organized faculty insurgence against administrative complacency or educational stand-pattism is a far rarer occurrence than the numerous, patient, administrative efforts to bestir faculties to organized constructive efforts toward improved education.

The ability to see the entire institutional problem, the responsibility to have to cope with and get a working reconciliation out of all the factors and forces at work—this is the indispensable and invaluable *administrative* role. But its complexity is all too often ignored by faculty members. For it includes time and capacity for dealing with budgets, buildings, trustees, alumni, student sentiment, faculty staffing, to mention but a few. And not the least of these responsibilities is the one I am here stressing; namely, *leadership concern* that the educational experience of young people shall be the *best* that the college knows how to offer.

Along with the stimulative role which the leading of every organization requires if it is to keep alive, there is, of course, also the administrative function of assuring that energies are conserved and rights protected among those who staff the institution. I shall not expatiate upon that role. Rather I make what I believe is a fair assumption that most college administrations give anguished concern to the protection of those aspects of individual, faculty members' security which bear on their ultimate freedom. This means

a defined, defensible, and hopefully a generous policy on salary schedules and promotions, on tenure provisions, on retirement annuities and sickness compensation, on sabbatical leaves, on teaching loads, and other items. These provisions are or should be intrinsic to the teacher's relation to the institution, even though we all recognize the abuses which may arise from a few individual teachers laying down on the job. Even in respect to such abuses, however, it is possible for wise administrative guidance to elevate faculty standards of hard work and high attainment by a deliberate stimulation of morale, of public recognition and rewards.

In this connection I note the following salient paragraph by an experienced administrator who is addressing himself to the special problems of teachers who take on the general education courses which often are not the responsibility of individual departments. Dr. Malcolm S. MacLean says:

In the face of this conservative and protective faculty behavior, it is the job of the administrator to see to it that his teachers in General Education get a break. He must so plan that these people get their advancement in rank and salary, their annuity and retirement insurances, their sabbatical leaves, their appointment to faculty policy and operations committees, in the same way and to the same degree that those who teach history, sociology, or chemistry get theirs. He must reward one who discovers a better way to use one of the tools or techniques of General Education as much as one who finds out how to frustrate a rat, or what Anthony really said to Cleopatra, or whether Shakespeare left his second best bed to Anne Hathaway.¹

IV. What Can Be Done?

I have now set forth certain problems of college operation and process, and raised questions as to whether faculties act as freely as they should to meet the challenge thus posed.

¹ Malcolm S. MacLean, "The Role of the Administrator in General Education" in the valuable new magazine, *Improving College and University Teaching*, February 1955, p. 13.

I have suggested why a new look at and with our students confirms the need for a new dynamism of faculty attack upon the qualitative outcomes of the college career.

I have characterized the role of administrative leadership as crucial both as a challenging and as a protective force.

The central thesis has been that the desired freedom is potentially in the possession of our faculties—freedom to address ourselves to today's education as an over-all effort with fresh emphasis upon contemporary purpose and need. Yet, the freedom seems more potential than presently potent.

What then can be done?

Some aids in the desired direction can come from administrative leaders; some can come from faculty members themselves; some are a matter of time and especially of the altered character of our Ph.D. education in the years ahead.

As to further administrative assistance, the actual structuring of faculty representative bodies and study groups can be important. Committees large and small can play valuable roles under chairmen carefully chosen for their creative ideas and talents of diplomacy. It seems clear that frequently issues of general principle and statements of objectives are harder to agree upon than specific measures which may hopefully represent part of a larger ultimate plan.

A faculty Committee on Long-Range Planning with some annual rotation of membership can, for example, help to widen the horizons of concern of many faculty members who may never before have given thought to the curriculum as a whole and to the education of the student as a whole.

The use of faculty members as student advisers can broaden their grasp of student points of view, if the student

personnel program is carefully designed.

Special incentives including entertainment money can help encourage faculty members to more home hospitality to students.

Faculty member oversight and counsel of extra-curricular activities can have value.

Faculty meetings and department meetings in which the president and dean call for special attention to educational problems under guided direction can help. In this connection I can bear witness as a publisher that the amount of present faculty reading of books and articles on education as distinct from scholarship subject matter in one's chosen field, is astonishingly small. Yet it could be an invaluable mind-disruter and eye-opener.

In the selection of new faculty personnel, more might be done to find those whose interests range beyond their own subject-matter field.

These are some of the administrative ways in which experience shows that new ideas gain wider acceptance.

Second, faculty members themselves run the whole range from breadth to narrowness of educational interest and solicitude. Department chairmen can be crucially helpful here; and whatever can be done to assure the selection of department heads who are not "isolationists" is all to the good. Interdepartmental studies are increasingly essential.

Voluntary faculty discussion groups often with outside speakers have their value. Group discussions of the increasing literature on college teaching can be stimulating.

In fields where for whatever reason shifts of instructional program minimize or eliminate the need for certain teachers, there can sometimes be a re-

education of the teacher by a year's leave of absence in order to qualify him to teach a kindred subject.

Those older teachers who are intransigent about every proposal of educational change can better be left alone and by-passed, although this is likely to be a burden to the payroll.

Third, the final, long-range aid is the gains we are entitled to expect in the outlook and equipment of young teachers coming from our graduate schools as these shift, all too slowly, to broader methods of teacher instruction through the Ph.D. or other possible degree or certificate. As general education becomes better understood and more universally accepted, it is inevitable that more graduate schools will change in directions of which we already have a few heartening instances.

But when all is said, and I still speak of the challenge to freedom, the challenge remains to the integrity, the vision, the courage, the fresher conception of scholarship of the faculties themselves.

Faced as we are by the unparalleled pressures of greater student numbers, and of world issues to be bravely and intelligently faced by adult citizens, the freedom to teach well, which *has* to be preserved, is in the hands jointly of faculties and administrators. If they will collaborate in goodwill and flexibility, the transition ahead can be greatly eased and a better job will be done. For the unhappy alternative would be that we continue to carry on a stand-off tension in which faculties mistakenly think that administrators regard them as employees. Rather the truth is that faculties and administrators are free to be colleagues, dedicated to adding quality to our quantitative challenge in the years ahead.

MILO BAIL, President, *University of Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska*

Six Decades of Progress¹

UPON THE OCCASION of this sixtieth Anniversary of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, it is fitting that we pause for a few moments to consider the development and growth, the enduring values, enduring problems, and enduring challenges of one of the most significant educational organizations developed in this nation during the past sixty years. To understand the beginning and early development of this significant institution, it is well to consider the industrial, social, and political conditions which existed in the late nineties.

The development of inventions, the expansion of factories, railroads, commercial enterprises, and new business ventures were making this an entirely different land. Wealth was accumulating at an enormous rate, a new social order was developing, and under these conditions enrolments at the secondary and higher levels entered a period of unprecedented growth. Prior to this time higher education had been primarily a class institution.

From 1890, for the next thirty years the enrolments in the secondary schools doubled each decade and grew twelve times faster than the general population, while the enrolment in colleges and universities increased approximately five times faster than the general population. These conditions resulted in educational unrest in the secondary schools and the higher institutions which caused leaders in both areas to question the educational pat-

terns then provided. About this time a significant voice was raised regarding the necessity for meeting the needs of the students who entered the high schools and colleges. Also, the lack of teacher preparation and poor instructional procedures confused the issues. In most of the states of the North Central territory there was little or no legal or other control of either the colleges or secondary schools. To be sure, the Harvard movement initiated by President Elliott to liberalize entrance requirements and to provide for the free election of courses had caused many of the colleges to adopt that system. Likewise, the Michigan plan for accrediting secondary schools had made significant progress and was being adopted in other states. By 1895 all of these forces were having a decided influence upon curricular organization and were giving rise to numerous problems that called for a closer relationship between the institutions of higher education and the secondary schools.

About this time a young man by the name of William H. Butts was serving as principal of the Michigan Military Academy at Orchard Lake. Upon his return from a meeting of the recently established New England Association of Schools and Colleges, he was charged with a new idea. Recognizing the need for better relationships between the secondary schools and the colleges and universities of the Midwest, he conceived the idea of developing a similar organization for the North Central territory. He attempted to arouse the interest of President Angell, of Michi-

¹ Delivered at the First General Session of the Association, March 24, 1955, in Chicago.

gan, in the necessity for developing such an organization. At first President Angell was not friendly to the undertaking, stating with wisdom far ahead of its time—that we can appreciate far better today—that there were already too many associations and organizations. Butts was not to be denied and forthwith presented his plans to President Harper, of Chicago; President Rogers, of Northwestern; President Adams, of Wisconsin; and a good many others. Particularly, he influenced the Michigan Schoolmaster's Club and secured the sponsorship of that organization for the newly organized association. Finally President Angell relented and agreed that his name might head the invitation list which should be sent to certain secondary schools, colleges, and universities in the ten North Central states of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, for a meeting in Evanston to discuss the need for such an organization. We note that after the first meeting Mr. Butts disappeared from the scene and that the President of Michigan took over. Likely one of the reasons was the fact that Mr. Butts soon became a professor of mathematics and later dean of the College of Engineering at Michigan to serve for a period of some twenty-five years. Thirty-six institutions responded to the invitation to meet at Northwestern University in Evanston with President Rogers on March 29-30, 1895. The N.C.A. was organized, a constitution drafted, and officers elected. President Angell became the first president of the new Association and had ten vice-presidents, one from each state. The secretary was Principal Bliss, of the Detroit Central High School, and the treasurer was Headmaster Carman, of Morgan Park Academy. Five other representatives were nominated to the

Executive Committee. The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was on its way.

In the few minutes available to me on this sixtieth Anniversary of the Association, it is possible to point out only a few of the highlights in the development and growth of this great organization and indicate certain parallels which still confront us. It is indeed a romantic story, one which I should like to recommend as required reading for those who are particularly interested not only in the educational growth of the past half-century but also those who wish to gain insight into some of the problems which still must be solved. I would like to refer you to Grinnell's, *The Rise of the North Central Association*, as reported in Vols. IX and X of the NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, also, of course, to that outstanding volume by Calvin O. Davis, *A History of the North Central Association*, written upon the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary and from which I have borrowed freely. Every problem facing us today is but an extension of the problems which have faced educational institutions throughout the whole history of the North Central Association.

I should like to recall some of the enduring values, mountain peak experiences, outstanding leaders, significant committees and commissions, important terms and standards, outstanding studies and reports, magic numbers, and parliamentary decisions or rulings which have exerted tremendous influence not only upon the secondary schools and higher institutions in some twenty midwestern states during the past half-century but to the national scene as a whole.

I should like to call your attention to some of the major problems and the persistence of these problems as they have been reported throughout all of

these six decades of the N.C.A. A few perennials for which we have found no solution include the ever-increasing enrolment problem and the tremendous growth of secondary and higher education, with all the attendant problems of faculty, facilities, and funds. In addition, we have the problem of interscholastic and intercollegiate athletics, and the pro and con of accreditation, the proliferation of courses and the numerous issues of general versus specialized curricular offerings. All of these, both curricular and extracurricular, as well as the standards and criteria, both quantitative and qualitative have persisted throughout these six decades. Practically every one of them you will find in some form or another on the program of this sixtieth Anniversary meeting, and I am confident that we shall discuss, but not solve them, either at this meeting or in the seventh decade to come.

As we give our attention to items of particular significance to the Association at the turn of the century, let us remember always that the basic purpose for the founding of this Association was the establishment of cooperative relationships between secondary schools and colleges and universities within the North Central territory. In his presidential address of 1897, President Adams called attention to the tremendous problem resulting from the rapidly increasing enrolment when he stated, "We now have in the universities of the 10 North Central states 15,000 students—1,000 more than all the New England colleges and universities combined. We also have 541 high schools in 5 states of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska, enrolling 68,000 students." The enrolment problem has remained one of our perennials.

The first resolution of the new Association was passed in 1897, namely,

that the Association go on record as warning institutions to check the tendency which existed in the larger institutions of entrusting freshman classes to inexperienced teachers. When we think of the parallel today, some of us are concerned that thousands of college freshmen are being short-changed in their educational experience, and at the same time that their instructors—in many cases graduate students—are also being exploited in the name of higher education.

The first committee appointed was that on the teaching of English in 1898. In fact, the first efforts directed to the study of the curriculum, another perennial, began with the launching of the N.C.A. The Commission on Accredited Schools was first established in 1901 along with the Board of Inspectors. Within five years this commission had become a Commission on Accredited Schools and Colleges, and by 1912 it occupied the center of the stage, serving as the chief policy-making body of the Association, the chief administrative organization, with its Board of Inspectors as the dominating force. The parent organization, namely, the Association, was by this time largely an organization to listen to the reports of the Commission, hear various scholars from other areas and to exchange fraternal greetings at the annual meeting.

During this first decade, the standards for accrediting schools, the definition of the unit course of study, the required length of periods, the required number of periods per week, and the requirements for high school graduation and college entrance, were first developed.

In every decade there have been addresses, debates, heated discussions, and informal talks with respect to the development of policies of accreditation or with their postponement which

have been destined to change the course of educational history.

The first of these outstanding debates was that between President Draper, of the University of Illinois, and Dean Judson, of the University of Chicago, regarding the adoption of accrediting policies. Dean Judson was one of the strong advocates for standards and accreditation, while President Draper argued that accreditation should not become one of the major activities of this new association. He believed that the major function of the Association was that of discussion and debate but that no resolutions should ever be passed. This issue was debated so vigorously that it resulted in a delay of the acceptance of the accrediting policies.

The cool-off period evidently worked, because the Association voted favorably the following year—1904—on this particular action, when it approved the first list of accredited schools. As C. O. Davis has reported, the meetings of the first decade were primarily spirited conferences and discussions closely resembling high-class teacher institutes. Policies were discussed but there was no power of enforcement.

The second decade of the Association may well be considered the most important because it was during this time that it became a real power, exerting its influence to all schools, colleges, and universities, not only in the North Central territory but elsewhere as well. In 1905 the first committee on the definition of a unit was appointed, the Commission on Accredited Schools became the Commission on Accredited Schools and Colleges and had its first complete set of standards adopted. By 1906 the Board of Inspection submitted for approval a list of 285 schools, almost doubling the list of 1904. This is indicative of the receptive attitude of the secondary schools toward

the accreditation program.

Another major issue developed in 1907 when the high schools became anxious that colleges also be accredited. The first standards for colleges and universities were drawn in 1909, and in 1910—eight years after the high schools were accredited—the machinery was set in motion for accrediting colleges and universities. Here again the discussions waxed vigorous and it was not until 1912 that all member colleges and universities of the North Central Association were given accredited status. The first actual published list appeared in 1913.

With the adoption of administrative policies and the enforcement of standards, although membership continued to be on a voluntary basis the actual fact is that institutions could not afford to remain outside the charmed circle.

It was during this second decade that a number of significant and long-lasting influences were exerted. For example, here we find in one of the many debates regarding the accreditation of colleges, the definition of a college by President Jesse, of the University of Missouri: "It must have respectable entrance requirements—the courses must be selected from the classics—there must be at least 8 departments headed by 8 full-time instructors, each possessing at least the Master's degree with post-Master's recommended, whose load should not be more than 18 hours per week, with 15 recommended . . . there should also be a good library, and fifth, the products must be properly prepared that they may be recommended for graduate school." A long-lasting standard was set when he stated that the maximum class size should be thirty. When President Jesse was asked a question regarding the productive endowment necessary for a college, his reply with the reason therefor was simply this: eight

full-time instructors at \$1,500 annually would result in a faculty salary budget of \$12,000 which is a 6 percent return on \$200,000; therefore, \$200,000 should be the minimum productive endowment. Strangely enough this figure was adopted and continued to be the standard until revised upward in 1927 by the skillful and ardent work of some of the leaders of that period. Here, then, we have at least two of those very important and magic numbers that have influenced the North Central colleges for long periods at a time—thirty for class size and \$200,000 for productive endowment. Both numbers plucked out of the air to serve as magic symbols for class size and productive endowment which would influence for years to come every administrative decision from faculty load and salaries to the size and number of classrooms to be built. I sometimes wonder, however, whether we do any better today in our selection of standards.

The Commission report for 1910 went on record as advocating the granting of college credit for work done in secondary schools beyond the required fifteen units, with certain expressed qualifications. The Commission provided no way of enforcing the principle but did take a definite step toward later provisions for junior colleges and for junior college work in secondary schools. Here again we have a parallel for today. In fact, a special conference has been held at this sixtieth meeting to discuss this perennial problem. Certain Foundations are today spending millions of dollars to determine whether or not it is possible for outstanding seniors to do college work even though they are still in the secondary school, and further whether it is possible for outstanding juniors and seniors to move from the secondary schools into the freshman and sophomore years of college work. Here is a problem first

mentioned in 1910 and repeatedly discussed until finally definite experimentation in the N.C.A. institutions in the 1920's proved the case. In 1955 we still spend money to prove that which we have already proved conclusively.

In 1910 we begin to see the question of college domination of the high school prominently appearing. One of the major parts of the report of 1910 was devoted to the definition of high school units. This was probably the first big report—the culmination of eight years of work—and included definitions of the high school subjects—English, mathematics, history, Latin, Greek, German, French, Spanish, physics, chemistry, geography, botany, zoology, commercial subjects, and manual training. In harmony with the provisions of 1906, a balance between secondary and college representation had been maintained on the committees. However, most of the chairmen were from the colleges and many of the criticisms coming from the Association were that many high school men felt that they had little or no share in the determination of the units that were prescribed for secondary schools. This problem, too, will appear again and again, yet in the end the main objective of the Association will always be remembered and good relationships between colleges and secondary schools will prevail.

From the earliest days of the Association when Superintendent Nightingale, of Chicago, had insisted upon the rights of the student to get what he needed and what he was fitted to have from the secondary school, the pendulum of allegiance swung away from the classics and toward the laboratory, sciences and vocational studies. No educational problem received so much attention on the floor of the Association during the last half of the second decade as did vocational guidance. Gradually the Association had become aware of

vocational education and consequently demanded study of the individual student. Thomas Arkle Clark, dean of men at the University of Illinois, exerted considerable influence when he presented a paper, "What Sort of People Should Go to College?" Along with this topic there also developed a definite dissatisfaction with the traditional 8-year elementary and 4-year high school, which resulted in a study of secondary education by influential secondary school men. Here again we find the North Central study resulting in the reorganization of schools and colleges. There was no association better qualified by membership and tradition than the North Central Association to discuss this program of reorganization.

During the second decade we find the influence of the accreditation of secondary education extending to outlying states and new states seeking affiliation in order to receive these benefits. The first standards regarding professional requirements for teachers were being considered, and the continuous study of high school curricula leading to the definition of units by 1910 culminated in the first clear and definite description of subject matter. A few leaders persistently promoted the accreditation of colleges and by 1910 the machinery had been devised, college standards drawn up, and a committee assigned to promote this project. The first list of seventy accredited colleges in fifteen states appeared in 1913. By this time the Association was also engaged in the study of vocational education, the six-six plan of school organization, co-education, and the guidance of college and high school freshmen.

The Association was still cleaving to the ideal of a small working body. Most of its officers had been active on committees and in its deliberations since early years. The first step away from

the equalized and limited group was taken in 1908 when the clause requiring parity between colleges and secondary schools was stricken. Secondary school membership over this time showed little gain. There were now only sixty-six colleges and fewer than one hundred high schools on the accredited list. The membership had fluctuated—some years larger, some years smaller—but toward the end of this decade we see that the accrediting movement had proved itself and was gaining steadily in influence.

However, it had its critics. One of the boldest was Professor Charles H. Judd, a newcomer to the Association and to the University of Chicago. In an address that year he attacked the accrediting scheme vigorously and offered some new and somewhat disturbing suggestions. It was better than the plan of the East, he said, but the standards lacked objectivity; they were merely opinions and admission to the accredited list was based on judgment for which the strong high schools cared little because the judgments were not full or convincing. He contended that the plan which was being employed failed to develop reciprocal relations. Why should not the high schools supervise the colleges? He proposed that the Association form a central committee to receive reports from all of the high schools and all of the higher institutions, indicating among other facts where each student ranked in his class. He held the scientific study of complete reports on students to be of more importance and of more value to the students than mere facilitation of college entrance. Although his suggestions were not accepted they did color much of the later activity of the Association, and did stimulate the study of the reports of the secondary schools and their application to the improvement of standards and accreditation in general.

The beginning of the third decade in 1915 was an important turning point. The Association had been satisfied with a small but fairly constant membership but now every effort was made to recognize institutions and to welcome them into membership which rose rapidly as it became more and more coextensive with the accredited list.

One of the most significant and far-reaching influences was a recommendation of the Board of Inspectors that had been adopted by the Commission in 1910; "Whereas, it is recognized that in order to be an inspiring and sympathetic leader of a student, the teacher himself should be a student and a growing intellectual force." Therefore, it was recommended that the Association through properly instituted committees take up the general study of the professional growth and training of teachers in service in secondary schools. It was not until 1915, however, that a specific requirement of eleven hours in education was prescribed as a professional requirement for all high school teachers of academic subjects. In 1925 it was raised to fifteen hours, where it was remained for the past thirty years. The tremendous influence of the eleven, ultimately the fifteen credit hours in education, along with the fact that North Central high schools were forced to employ teachers with degrees from North Central colleges and universities made the short first course in the normal school no longer satisfactory and created a direct and powerful influence on the normal schools to raise their standards and to become degree-granting colleges. "Eleven" and "fifteen"—two more magic numbers. Think of the influence they have exerted throughout the years, and what they have meant to the improvement of teacher education and the improvement of the instruction in high schools. We can readily see that

eleven and fifteen have been magic numbers but also that in many instances they have served as red flags to various academic areas. The debate continues even today.

By this time more than one thousand secondary schools were accredited over an area reaching from Michigan to Oklahoma. Standards had been improved and analytical studies made of the various North Central high schools. However, the N.C.A. did not include all of the eligible schools and its insistence on high standards caused colleges to disregard it in favor of the larger, more lenient Bureau of Education list and in this process to give little recognition to N.C.A. approval. Moreover, violations of several of the standards were so widespread that both the Jessup and Coffman analysis and that of Judd and Counts found cause for grave concern.

Further importance must be attached to the year 1915 because of the appearance before the Association that year of J. C. Babcock, then specialist in Higher Education in the U. S. Bureau of Education. He was active almost constantly thereafter in the accreditation of higher institutions of the N.C.A. Probably no other person with the exception of C. H. Judd and George Counts had so much to do with the establishment of procedures and standards during the early years of standardizing higher institutions as did J. C. Babcock. Later, as dean of the College of Liberal Arts at the University of Illinois, Mr. Babcock plunged into the work of the Association wholeheartedly, particularly with regard to the accreditation of higher institutions.

It was in 1914 that the Executive Committee of the Association recommended that the Commission reclassify all member institutions with the hope that they would name four classes, colleges, junior colleges, normal schools,

and secondary schools, define each group, determine its qualifications, and assign each institution to one of the classifications. But the list of 1915 was not so classified. However, this discussion of classifications resulted in the authorization of a study by C. H. Judd and George S. Counts which was published as a bulletin by the United States Bureau of Education in recognition of its importance to the classification of American colleges.

As the Association reached its twentieth Anniversary, fewer of the original university presidents who fostered the infant association were present. New leaders from the university—Judd, Babcock, Clark, Holgate—had sprung up in the Association, and the names of men who were to come into prominence in later years—Davis, Edmonson, Gage, Stradley, Buck, Stewart—were found on the register. Many of the younger secondary men of the 90's—Carman, Armstrong, Harris, Bliss, Bryan—were still faithful in attendance and active in their leadership. Thoroughly versed in the history and principles of the Association, they had been kept in "key" positions. Although the leadership was changing a little at a time, the next decade was to see the reorganization of the Association. Nonetheless, it was one of the veterans, J. E. Armstrong, principal of Englewood High School, who had served for fifteen consecutive years on the Executive Committee and as president in 1915, who was to shake the Association out of its lethargy and set in motion the forces of reorganization. To him it fell the lot of giving the twentieth presidential address. After launching into an analysis of the weakness of the Association and its organization and service, he concluded with a summarization of recommendations, the most important of which was that a committee should be appointed to

revise the constitution.

Following considerable discussion, Dean Holgate, of Northwestern University, and a judicious combination of men, both old and new, were appointed as the committee to revise the constitution. There are those who say that 1916 was a real milestone in the history of the North Central.

With the adoption of the new constitution, the three powerful semi-independent agencies known today as the Commissions came into existence. The names of these commissions were the Commission on Higher Education, today known as the Commission on Colleges and Universities, the Commission on Secondary Schools, and the Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula, which is today the Commission on Research and Service. The main functions of the Commission on Higher Education were to prepare standards for accrediting colleges and universities, to supervise the inspection of institutions seeking accreditation, and to submit recommendations to the Executive Committee for action upon such applications. From time to time this Commission has undertaken elaborate studies of problems of organization, administration, finance, faculty personnel, library, laboratory equipment and of similar topics. From these investigations have come many interesting and deeply significant reports which have led to the modification of various policies, standards, and procedures. Annual reports which had been originated by the previous Commission were continued in order that special studies might be made of various aspects of higher education. By 1922 the Commission had created what is now known as the Board of Review.

During this period the Secondary School Commission continued to consider problems dealing with the professional education of teachers, size of

class, and the number of students to be assigned to each academic teacher.

An important move was made in 1917 when it was ruled that proposed new standards of any radical sort should first be submitted by referendum to the principals of the accredited schools for their advice and then reported back to the Association for final action. By 1918 the work of the Commission on Secondary Schools was well organized. Each state had three classified members on its committee: one in secondary education from the state university, one from the state department, and a high school principal. During the latter part of this decade while standards were being improved, the list of accredited schools grew rapidly from 1,047 in 1915 to 1,349 in 1920. Professor C. H. Johnson, of the University of Illinois, became the first chairman of the newly constituted Commission on Unit Courses and Curricula. The immediate attention of this Commission was turned to the reports which Professors Johnson, Judd, and Koos had prepared on the organization of the secondary schools and the definition of the unit. The second problem referred to this Commission was that on the reorganization of instruction in secondary English. Note the persistence of these difficult problems. This Commission, however, planned an ambitious program of its own, the first of which was to organize the history of the curriculum work of the Association. The work of this Commission was no sooner launched than Professor Johnson died. This necessarily handicapped the new chairman, Jessie P. Newland, in carrying forward the program of the Commission.

For some time individuals dissatisfied with committee recommendations had taken their cases to the floor of the Association. Frequently, hours of time were consumed in more or less futile

effort to explain the alleged weaknesses of their respective institutions. Often bitter debates were held and lasting ill feelings were engendered. The drafters of the new constitution in 1916 sought to establish barriers which would check abuses of this nature. To do this, final authority in the accreditation of institutions had been placed, it was supposed, entirely with the Executive Committee. For some time after the new constitution had been adopted no attempt was made to settle such issues, possibly because the leaders felt that the floor debates would cease and that the Executive Committee would gradually assume final authority. However, a concluding sentence in one of the sections of the constitution read, "All the acts of the Executive Committee shall be subject to revision by the Association," the statement of a principle that had been regarded as the cornerstone of the organization in 1895.

In 1924, however, the problem arose at the time that Professor Judd was the president of the Association, and since he had been a member of the Committee that had drawn up the new constitution, he held decided views regarding the intent of the framers of that document. He held that lengthy floor discussions over the status of the particular institutions were unseemly and disgraceful, and was supported in this view by the other members of the Commission. When a decision on two issues was demanded in the Annual Meeting of 1924, an appeal from the findings of the Commission and the action of the Executive Committee in upholding the Commission's recommendation was taken to the Association itself. There Professor Judd definitely and positively ruled, and later was sustained, that the Commission alone had authority to fix standards and the Executive Committee alone had the final authority to hear and act

upon appeals. All that the Association as a whole could do, said he, was to approve or reject the standards presented to them by the Commission. The Association as a whole could not amend or rewrite them. Today no one questions the wisdom of the important ruling made by President Judd in 1924 and the constitution of 1942 gives the Executive Committee the final authority respecting appeals.

By the beginning of the fourth decade the Commission on Higher Institutions began the practice of allowing certain colleges to engage in experimentation in various types of administrative or curricular projects. In time the number of experiments going forward was fairly large. For the most part, these involved some relationship between the upper years of high school and the beginning years of college; for example, the double registration of students in the two types of institutions, using the high school courses with college courses or considering problems involving acceleration of superior students. Among the institutions in which such experiments were authorized were Cornell College, Stephens College, University of Chicago, the Tulsa and Gary public schools, as well as a host of others. Advisory or supervisory committees from the Association or the Commission were always appointed to oversee the work.

It might be well to repeat here that some of the experiments being conducted by various organizations and sponsored by certain foundations today at significant costs are merely repetitions of some of the experiments conducted by North Central Colleges and High Schools thirty years ago, particularly those with respect to the ability of high school students to do college work, or for high school juniors or seniors to elect college work prior to graduation.

In 1926 the **NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY** was authorized. To meet its cost and to defray the expenses of the rapidly expanding program of activities, the Association set the annual fee at \$5.00 for all secondary schools and \$25.00 for institutions of higher education. This regulation closed the gap between accreditation and institutional membership by noting that henceforth the two were to denote the same thing—there was to be no accreditation without membership and no membership without accreditation.

The Editorial Board elected Calvin O. Davis of the University of Michigan to be the first editor. He continued in that position until 1941 when Harlan C. Koch, the current editor, took over the responsibilities of that publication.

Probably the most revolutionary changes to that date affecting accrediting practices, both in the secondary schools and institutions of higher education, came during this fourth decade. For a number of years there had been criticism of published standards and of the methods of enforcing them. As time went on these criticisms became more insistent and specific. It was charged that criteria for judging an institution's effectiveness were formal and arbitrary and failed to strike a balance between the elements of weakness and the elements of strength in an institution's program. Also, little or no account was taken of the unique and special aims a school or college might have for itself, and further, that they overemphasized the quantitative and minimized the qualitative aspects in determining an institution's status. Finally in 1931, the Commission on Higher Education took the lead in working out reforms in this area. The Committee of fifteen under the chairmanship of President Coffman of the University of Minnesota, was appointed to study the entire problem of

college accrediting. This committee included outstanding leaders of the Association, supplemented by some from outside. The Executive Committee, under the leadership of Presidents Coffman, Gage, and Zook, secured a grant from the General Education Board of \$110,000 to conduct the study, this being supplemented by the Association and the separate colleges to complete the total cost of \$140,000. The Commission report, designed to develop new techniques for evaluating the educational program of higher education, was presented in April, 1934, and adopted by the Association. It has guided and directed the accrediting procedure since that time. Probably the outstanding excerpts of the report are, "An institution will be judged for accreditation upon the basis of the total pattern it presents . . . [It] is recognized that wide variations will appear in the degree of excellence . . . [It] is accepted as a principle that superiority in some characteristics may be regarded as compensating to some extent for a deficiency in another . . . that facilities and activities of an institution will be judged in terms of the purposes it seeks to serve."

Immediately following the initiation of this action by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, the Commission on Secondary Schools proceeded to develop a similar plan. Complaints regarding the published standards had become so numerous and insistent that in 1932 the National Association of the Officers of the Regional Associations proposed a cooperative study of these problems. Consequently in 1933 plans for a cooperative study were initiated and soon put into operation. This study has been given various names—the study on evaluative criteria, Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards, the Two Hundred School Study, \$200,000 study, and the Eells study, for Walter

Crosby Eells directed the cooperative program for the six regional associations with the assistance of specific committees from each of these associations. Mr. George E. Carrothers, of the University of Michigan, was chairman of the general committee, ably assisted by Franzen, Giles, Morley, and Owens.

Just as the Commission on Higher Institutions took into consideration the total pattern of the schools, so did the cooperative study on secondary education. To do this, a series of percentile graphs called "educational thermometers" were devised and the percentile rating or "educational temperature" of each school recorded. Old quantitative standards, it is true, continued to be published and used but they no longer constituted the sole basis for judging a school's status. These evaluative criteria have been used widely in the improvement of secondary education all over the nation. In 1950 they were revised on the basis of ten years of experimentation.

The fourth decade then may be characterized by three significant events—the establishment of *THE QUARTERLY*, the revision of the standards for evaluating institutions of higher education by the Coffman Committee, and the Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards initiated in the North Central Association but carried forward on a nationwide basis, under the direction of all regional accrediting associations.

Thus at the beginning of the fifth decade in 1935, significant advancements had been made in the accrediting procedures for both secondary schools and institutions of higher education. Many studies were under way, and a casual examination of various issues of *THE QUARTERLY* will reveal significant articles and reports of many studies dealing with student personnel, the education of secondary school teachers, and various aspects of the improve-

ment of the total educational program—studies as pertinent today as then.

One event of this fifth decade stands out because of its significance for all times. The constitution provided that decisions of the Association are purely advisory in character but, nonetheless, that interpretation had been questioned on numerous occasions, and still is. To be sure, no member institution must necessarily be bound by any Association rule or regulation because, of course, it is possible to withdraw from the organization. On the other hand, it had always been held that the Association had a right to drop institutions from membership which did not comply with the regulations. The event referred to was the suit brought against the Association in 1938 by Governor Langer of North Dakota because an institution in that state had been dropped from membership. The Court held that the Association, being a purely voluntary organization, may determine its own standards; that its list of accredited institutions may be made up in accordance with the published standards; and that its constitution, by-laws, and rules knowingly assented to by a member become in fact a civil contract. Consequently, in the breach of contract the decision of the Association may be accepted as conclusive. This Court decision, of course had far-reaching implications. It resulted in the 1942 revision of the constitution which specifically incorporated most of the Court's findings on this case. This decade was also to see the members of the North Central Association engaged in war activities for the second time with the accompanying mobilization of all of the educational resources of the Association to assist in the war effort.

The sixth and immediate past decade was one in which the Association confronted again many of its early prob-

lems. The rapidly increasing enrollment of the veterans of World War II necessitated tremendous adjustments in standards and accrediting procedures for both secondary and higher institutions. Answers to various problems were obtained which benefited every member of the Association. That the colleges universities, and secondary schools have met their post-war problems in such an effective manner attests the splendid relationship which continues to exist between the three commissions and the various institutions of the Association.

For some years prior to 1950, the multiplicity and duplication of accrediting associations, not only for institutions as a whole but also for separate colleges, separate departments, and separate divisions, has been growing to such an extent that practically every administrator was uneasy if not alarmed over the direction which these activities were taking. The urgency of the accrediting problem became so pressing that the National Commission on Accrediting was activated under the chairmanship of former Chancellor Gustavson, of the University of Nebraska. Primarily because of the conflicting interests of the various accrediting agencies, their multiplicity and variability, as well as the increased burdens, it was believed that the time had come to examine the present practices of accrediting and all of the problems incident thereto. That the issue was a critical one is attested by the fact that immediately more than six hundred members from all parts of the United States joined the Commission by paying still another fee to participate in this study of the problems of accreditation. I shall not go into any of the workings of this Commission except to say that the Commission on Colleges and Universities, and particularly the Committee on

Professional Education, has spent the past two years discussing the problems accruing to it from the reports and meetings of the National Commission. Revisions of the constitution will be presented at this meeting to enable the Commission on Colleges and Universities to meet anew the accreditation function, particularly from a decentralized and regional standpoint and with some emphasis on the qualitative rather than the quantitative aspects.

In 1902 Alonzo A. Stagg, Athletic Director and coach at the University of Chicago made the first study of inter-collegiate athletics for the Association. Here is a *real* perennial. Practically every year since that time something about the intercollegiate and interscholastic athletic programs of the member schools has been on the agenda. The tremendous growth of intercollegiate athletics with all of their attendant problems of recruitment, subsidies, schedules, and financing has kept this problem continuously in the forefront of the activities of the Commission on Higher Education and periodically the Association as a whole. Particularly has this been true during the immediate past. A committee report growing out of a series of studies of the problems of athletics for the past four or five years is one of the major items of business at this sixtieth annual meeting. We note here another persistent problem for which the Association seemingly has no answer.

During the immediate past, the Commission on Colleges and Universities has taken significant steps particularly with regard to the study of its service aspects. For two years the decentralization of the Commission has been given careful attention by the Committee on Reorganization to the end that it might reflect more nearly the needs and desires of its member institutions and

provide the services which it should rightfully afford.

The Planning Committee has given a great deal of time to the study of the program of activities to be initiated by the Commission. The Committee on Professional Education has centered its attention on the problems involved in and the relationships of professional accreditation. During the past two years the work of the Executive Secretary and of the three major Committees of the Commission named above has resulted in a series of significant changes which will be considered by the Association at the forthcoming business meeting later in the week. It is too early for a safe prediction but conceivably a new era of progress is in store for the Commission on Colleges and Universities.

During the past ten years the Commission on Secondary Schools has made its most significant advances as the state committees put the "Evaluative Criteria" into operation. In my humble opinion, the annual meetings of the State Chairmen have resulted in great advances in the development of secondary education. Under such leadership in the nineteen North Central states the secondary schools have attained high stature and achieved significant positions in our several communities.

As for the Commission on Research and Service, the past decade can be characterized by numerous studies, reports, and research activities. The most significant work has been in three areas:

First, the development and distribution of "Experimental Units" in various subject matter fields for which new curricular materials of a vital and practical character are needed have continued.

Second, the area of teacher education, particularly with reference to the conferences, workshops, and coopera-

tive program study of approximately seventy-five liberal arts colleges has received vigorous attention. A similar program involves about twenty-five teachers colleges and currently the initiation of such a program for multi-purpose institutions. The studies, regional conferences, and discussion sections at the annual meetings of the Sub-committee on In Service Education have represented a significant program.

Third, the Committee on Current Problems, which began as the Committee on Fundamentals during World War II, has completed numerous studies of such problems as reading, guidance, physical education, arithmetic, extracurricular activities, and the integration of college and university programs. The cooperation between the Commission on Secondary Schools and the Commission on Research and Service through especially appointed joint committees has proved to be most beneficial. One of the most significant achievements is the development of the contract with the Armed Forces Institute for the production of materials which would enable secondary school youngsters to learn more about preparation for military service.

As we celebrate the Sixtieth Anniversary and begin a new decade, we find the same problems facing us that faced us sixty years ago. To meet these problems more adequately and keep pace with the demands which the tidal wave of enrollments is beginning to make upon the secondary schools and the colleges, it is necessary that the Association immediately mobilize all its resources in the light of its past sixty years for a mass attack in the years ahead.

With apologies to the next speakers on this program, I should like to offer a brief preview of the needs of the N.C.A. for the seventh decade based

upon six decades of progress.

First of all, I should like to recommend that educational institutions take a page from industry's book and begin to devote a certain amount, possibly one or two per cent of the budget, to educational research. If colleges and schools are to keep pace with the advances in other areas of our economy, they must have realistic answers to the problems of administration, curriculum, and instruction based upon sound educational research.

Certain it is in the decade ahead that the major problems will be concerned with faculty, facilities, and funds. Currently, the N.C.A. could serve a very vital function if it were to organize working committees or other agencies through the Commission on Higher Education to find the answers to some of the problems of space utilization, the recruitment and education of competent faculty members, and effective financing of the educational program.

Next, most of the criticisms of education in the N.C.A. could be properly answered if the "clearing house" function were as well served as it should be. Only a year or two ago the Executive Committee authorized the publication of a small bulletin *That You May Know Your N.C.A.* in an attempt to develop a closer contact with the members. I am delighted that after a period of two years the new Executive Secretary, Dr. Boardman, has launched *N.C.A. Today*, the new publication which we hope will serve as a step toward the real job of serving the "clearing house" function.

From past experience, I know that hundreds of schools and colleges in this territory have questions that they would like to have answered. In many cases the answers are known but not available, primarily because the attention we give to this clearing house or

public relations function has lagged too far behind that which we have given to the function of accreditation.

A third area to which we must give immediate attention is that of the reproduction of the profession. By and large, I think we can truthfully say that most college professors and high school teachers encourage outstanding students to enter practically every profession except that of teaching. More attention must be given to the problem of the selection of assistants and internes because they represent the pool from which we shall recruit the faculty of tomorrow. To prevent inbreeding, a project involving the exchange of assistants and internes between higher institutions should be given careful consideration in the immediate future. This might well be an extension of the current exchange internships financed by the Ford Foundation.

A fourth proposal for immediate study is that of the development of individuals on each faculty to conduct various programs of self-evaluation.

At the recent regional meeting in Omaha, the speaker proposed that a pilot study be started in the summer of 1955, to which a selected number of competent individuals who have been engaged in evaluating institutions of higher education would come together to assist in the training of others; and that, following the establishment of regional areas for the Commission on

Colleges and Universities, regional workshops be scheduled so that every institution of higher education might have one or two representatives acquiring the skills, understandings, and abilities needed for institutional evaluation that they might return to their separate institutions to lead their faculties in self-evaluation surveys.

This pilot study should receive very early but careful planning so that a proposal might be presented to one of the foundations for financing. This education of faculty, staff, and administrative officers in self-evaluative techniques might well be one of the most important next steps in the improvement of higher education.

As we prepare to meet the tidal wave of the next decades, I urge the Association to concentrate its attention, energy, and finances upon educational research, upon serving the clearing house or public relations function, upon the recruitment and education of competent faculty members both for the colleges and secondary schools, and immediately launch a program for the development of competent individuals on each campus and in each region for the self-evaluation of institutions of higher education. The leadership which this Association has furnished for the improvement of education during the past sixty years is but a step to even greater achievements in the years which lie ahead.

Liberal Arts and Education Education¹

I SHOULD LIKE TO BEGIN my remarks today by telling you about a former neighbor of mine in Connecticut. Fred Holmes met me at the village store one day and, plunging right into what was on his mind, said, "You know, Stumpy Hall is the most stubborn man I've ever seen. Yesterday we went fishing out on the Sound. I rowed out about two miles, and we fished for a while. Then I said: 'Stumpy, it's your turn to row back.' And Stumpy said: 'I won't.' And I said: 'You will.' And he said: 'I won't.' And, do you know, I had to take off my clothes and swim in to make that man row back. I've never seen a more stubborn man in my life."

Is it possible that some of us Freds see the same talent for stubbornness in the Stumpies who surround us?

When the talk turns to the proper preparation of teachers, whichever side we are on, we are quick to see the mote in our brother's eye without ever considering the possibility of a beam clouding our assuredly clear vision. And in these discussions, it seems that extremism begins to supersede rational discussion. Each party edges closer and closer to the dangerous argumentative precipice of all-encompassing generalizations, then plunges into the abyss of finalities from which there can be no return. Surely, if we are educated and gentlemen (characteristics which some of us, I fear, tend by our actions on occasion to deny) we could approach

this problem with the cool calm of deliberative discussion. In a recent article, entitled "Scholars and Schoolmen," in the *Michigan Alumnus Quarterly Review*,² Marten ten Hoor, the wise Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Alabama, says:

The present character of the controversy seems to indicate, first of all, the advisability of a lowering of the emotional temperature. We may talk all we like about being rational beings, in distinction from the animals; but that should not blind us to the fact that emotions not only interfere with calm reflection but also act as positive determinants of the direction of our thinking. . . . Given the lowering of the emotional temperature, we may hope that the contestants will withdraw from their defensive positions and take a calm and sober inventory of what they believe and why. There will then be less evangelistic talk about ideals to be defended and causes to be saved and more reflection on the meaning of concepts and definitions and on the search for and critical examination of relevant data.

As is the case in most disputes, some justification lies on both sides. Each of the disputants can advance a point that has a measure of truth, but is not properly met with a more violent counter-claim from the other side. When a professor seriously poses the question, "Can Our Teachers Read and Write?", as does James D. Koerner in the November (1954) issue of *Harper's Magazine*,³ we should pause and listen to his experience with twenty-eight primary and secondary-school teachers

¹ Presidential Address before the Fall meeting (1954) of the Michigan College Association.

² Vol. LX, No. 21, pp. 297-307, Aug. 7, 1954.

³ Vol. 209, No. 1254, pp. 79-81.

who took his course in English literature this past summer. Here is no wild man flailing in all directions. His is a careful tale, told without passion. That many graduates of liberal arts colleges can turn in no better performance than did these teachers is not an adequate reply to Professor Koerner's question.

It seems to me that when all the dust and smoke which becloud this academic battlefield are cleared away, we shall be able to find justification for claims on both sides. Can we, in the liberal arts, state with confidence that we are actually achieving the goals which we assert to be the products of a liberal education? How can we hold up our heads, much less claim a sacrosanct superiority, in the face of the evidence adduced by Professor Harry J. Fuller in his brief article in *Science*,⁴ when he points out that of fifteen candidates for the doctorate in botany, horticulture, agronomy, and zoology at the University of Illinois, seven had never heard of the Magna Carta, and six more were unable to identify it satisfactorily; thirteen were unable to give a satisfactory explanation of the Monroe Doctrine; only one of the fifteen could explain who the Medicis were; and ten of the fifteen had no satisfactory idea of what the Reformation was? Professor Fuller wants to know whether candidates in the humanities could do any better with ten notable theories, discoveries, and persons in the history of science.

While the liberal arts man makes his many charges, I feel that his argument finally settles on one main point, namely, his deep belief that the educationists have created a political machine designed to vest their group with ultimate and unassailable power that excludes from their esoteric group all gentiles. It is this concept of an exclu-

sive group that frightens the liberal arts man, frightens him, not for himself, but for the field of education, of which he deeply feels himself a part. The liberal arts man's fright rises in intensity when he sees the educationists proceed to prescribe codes for the accreditation of teachers, taking little account of, and often not even having any consultation with, the liberal arts people who carry the primary load in the preparation of those teachers. It is under these conditions that the political machine appears as a juggernaut which, on the one hand calls for a blind devotion from its followers, and on the other hand relentlessly crushes the hapless victims who lie in its path. The liberal arts man feels that, ultimately, education itself will fall before the monster.

While the educationist makes his many charges, I feel that his argument also finally settles on a main point, namely, his conviction that the scholars live in a world not attuned to the democratic requirements of a modern age that needs functioning citizens. The educationist holds that his system is designed to produce people trained for living, rather than providing knowledge as a goal in itself. He believes that if the liberal arts people would be willing to apply current methods of evaluation, they would discover their own shortcomings. He is convinced, finally, that a person trained in scholarship and with no training in teaching should not be sent forth to perform a task which requires skills foreign to the training in scholarship, and knowledge, principally the psychology of students, not a part of the scholar's subject matter field.

We at Wayne feel that we are on the way to a proper solution of this problem. The College of Liberal Arts and the College of Education have entered on a cooperative program of preparing

⁴ Vol. 120, p. 546, Oct. 1, 1954.

secondary school and junior college teachers at the master's and doctoral levels. Each college recognizes the unique contribution which the other can make. Joint committees develop curriculum and aspects of course content. Certain courses taught under the sponsorship of the College of Liberal Arts will be partially or wholly staffed with College of Education faculty members, and the reverse will also be true, with Liberal Arts faculty teaching in College of Education courses. Degree candidates will work under committees with faculty representation from both colleges.

As I have said, argument will not provide a reconciliation of these divergent attitudes. Knowledge—that is, a rational facing up to the verifiable facts on both sides—can.

The Michigan College Association is in a unique position to assume national leadership in this field. Composed as we are of small, liberal arts colleges, of great universities, of community col-

leges, and of colleges of education, we should be most capable of seeking and finding the proper continuum of education from the elementary school, through the secondary school, and to and through higher education. Unless we accept this responsibility, we not only lose our status as scholars, but, even worse, we undermine the service of mankind to which we have dedicated our lives. The time has come for us to cease being politicians in education. The time has come for us to become educational statesmen.

I urge that there be created a group charged with the task of preparing a proper study of the requirements for the preparation of teachers, and that the results of their study, upon agreement of this representative Association, become the standard of teacher training and certification in this State, to the end that future students in our schools may be provided with the finest possible type of preparation for life and leadership in our Nation.

The Role of Graduate Schools in Teacher Education: A Study of Ten Graduate Programs¹

IN THE SUMMER of 1954 the material for this report was gathered during short visits on ten campuses—most of them in the midwest, and all of them in the area served by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Visits were planned to include a variety of institutions. Both multi-purpose and teacher-training institutions with graduate programs were included. Summer programs were offered on each campus visited. Most of the institutions had off-campus activities which were an important part of their respective programs.

There was evidence on all campuses that graduate enrollments were increasing. In part this increase can be traced to the following influences:

1. Government subsidization of veterans.
2. Liberal policies of business and industry in financing and recognizing graduate degrees.
3. Monetary recognition given to graduate degrees (especially the master's degree) in the salary schedules of many schoolsystems.
4. The requirement of the master's degree or its equivalent for administrators in accredited schools. Many states have a similar requirement for the administrator's certificate.

This influx of students, many of whom are teachers and administrators, has brought some important modifications of the curricula leading to the

master's degree. In the ten schools visited as well as in many of our graduate schools, the following trends should be mentioned:

1. Much of the work for teachers and administrators is being given in summer school, night school, and off-campus offerings. The master's degree is no longer earned on campus during the regular academic year.
2. The thesis is being replaced by course work or by some type of substitute field study. Many teachers and administrators are not interested in writing theses.
3. Teachers have asked exemption from maximum load limits and have often been permitted to hasten the earning of the master's degree.
4. Graduate courses enrolling teachers have of necessity been much like undergraduate courses. The pressure of numbers alone has made the small class with active student participation a thing of the past—especially in summer graduate courses. The teacher who is primarily interested in filling gaps in his education is not ready for the advanced level of instruction which some think the mark of the graduate course. As a result, the fifth year of education for teachers and administrators has become to a considerable degree an extension of the four-year college program.
5. Workshop courses have become a regular part of graduate instruction for teachers and administrators. This type of course offers the student a chance to capitalize on his own professional experience. It also gives students opportunity to seek answers to problems which have grown out of their professional experience.
6. While the requirement of proficiency in a foreign language has remained in some master's programs, it has all but disappeared in programs for teachers and administrators.

¹ Read at the annual meeting of the Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research, March 22, 1955, in Chicago, and printed here because Mr. McCulloch gathered his information from North Central institutions.—EDITOR.

7. The traditional requirement of an undergraduate B average, or its equivalent, has been modified almost everywhere. Some master's degree programs require only the bachelor's degree for admission to graduate study. It is almost universal to require that those who are admitted to graduate study must later be admitted to candidacy for the degree. A variety of screening devices is used in admitting graduate students to candidacy for the master's degree. It is possible that those not capable of effective graduate work can be eliminated at this step if there is little selectivity at the time of admission to graduate school.

This study of graduate programs can be arranged into five areas, each of which will be given some consideration. These five areas are:

1. Admission to graduate school.
2. Graduate programs for teachers and administrators.
3. Summer graduate programs.
4. Graduate extension and night school programs.
5. Grade distribution in graduate courses, especially those in Education.

ADMISSION TO GRADUATE SCHOOL

There are two schools of thought concerning the nature of graduate work and the requirements that should be set for admission to graduate school. Some think it takes a higher level of ability to do adequate graduate work. It is also widely recognized that the degree of maturity of a student is an important factor. Those who expect outstanding ability as well as more maturity feel that admission to graduate school should be selective. It is their view that teachers should maintain the same high standards of scholarship and research that have been demanded of students in other fields of graduate study. It is interesting that a dean who gave strong verbal support to this position a few years ago is the responsible chairman of a graduate program for teachers which accepts teachers and administrators on the much more liberal basis which has wide acceptance

today. The second school of thought proceeds on the principle that the graduate school has an obligation to provide a meaningful and profitable year of study beyond the bachelor's degree, especially for those who are qualified teachers. Those who hold this liberal philosophy think the master's degree should be given in recognition of this additional year of study.

The ten schools included in this report divide into two groups. Four require more than the bachelor's degree for admission to graduate school. The requirements for admission of teachers and administrators are nearer the C average than they are the B average in undergraduate work. Many other departments in these four institutions usually require nearer a B average than a C average at the undergraduate level. In two institutions the admission to graduate work in the department of psychology was not granted to all applicants with a B average. The members of these departments justified this high level by maintaining that their facilities were limited and that preparation for the profession of psychologist should be more restricted than for the teaching profession.

All institutions have some procedure for admitting non-degree students. All of these four institutions provide for promising teachers with poor undergraduate records. They may be admitted on probation; they may be admitted after completing a term of undergraduate work with a B average; or they may be required to complete more than the minimum hours required for the degrees for which they are working.

One of these four schools reported the following rejections for 1952-53:

Applicants	Admitted	Rejected	Percent rejected
1,868	1,522	346	15.6

Another of the four schools with selective admission reported the following rejections for 1954-55 (as of June 1, 1954):

	Appli- cants	Ad- mitted	Re- jected	Percent rejected
All graduate students	1,361	913	448	33
Grad. students in education	99	81	18	18
Grad. students in psychology	187	47	140	75

Six schools require only the bachelor's degree for admission to graduate programs for teachers. One of them requires a C average in undergraduate work as well as the bachelor's degree. In these six schools there are departments and schools which are more selective than Education. Since departments often set their own standards for admission, such standards may vary within the same graduate school.

The trend seems to be to accept teachers and administrators with bachelor's degrees. Only a few applicants with especially weak undergraduate records would be rejected in a great many institutions.

GRADUATE PROGRAMS FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

The numerical importance of teachers and administrators in our graduate schools is beyond dispute. Some of the programs studied were exclusively for teachers and administrators. In one multiple-purpose institution which awarded 564 degrees in 1953-54, 347 were Master of Education degrees. In another multiple-purpose institution 533 of 3,035 degree students were specializing in Education. Of the 1,487 working on the master's degree, 354 were working for the Master of Education. Of 1,498 working for the doctor's degree, 179 were enrolled in Education.

Most of the ten institutions provide

some substitute for the master's thesis. In some institutions additional courses may replace the thesis. Usually the student has to take an additional summer's study to complete the extra course work. A few schools permit the substitution of research papers in approved courses. One institution permits the substitution of a field study, and in another, a project may replace the thesis. In one multiple-purpose institution the staff members said that it was almost unknown for a master's thesis to be written in Education. Staff members would not undertake the supervision of a master's thesis because they felt they needed their time to supervise doctoral work. Several staff members in the institutions which still retain the thesis requirement were convinced that it was just a matter of time until the requirement would disappear. Dissatisfaction with the thesis research and writing was encountered as well as a sense of frustration among the staff members of institutions which retain the hard-and-fast thesis requirement. They were convinced that they were spread too thin by the demands of thesis supervision, participation in final orals, and advisement service.

A number of those responsible for graduate programs for teachers expressed the opinion that teachers need a wider and deeper academic program rather than research experience. It was also common to hear the view expressed that the graduate program should meet the educational deficiencies of those admitted to graduate study. This need for meeting deficiencies is especially observed in elementary teachers. Since undergraduate courses would meet the need of the teacher or administrator but would not advance the student toward the coveted master's degree, one solution is to give the teacher graduate credit for gap-filling. There are several ways

to do this. For instance, if he takes a junior-senior course it is thought entirely respectable to give him graduate credit if he does additional work. Some schools limit the amount of such credit that may be included in a degree program. It is possible to give reduced hours of graduate credit for undergraduate courses. It is also possible to give undergraduate work to graduate students as a graduate course and expect the maturity of the students to result in an upgrading of the level of work.

During my summer of travel and study I observed a few experimental developments in graduate programs for teachers. At Iowa State Teachers College a graduate student council has been organized. This device is used in summer only. This council has served a useful purpose. On the same campus I found a student-teaching course offered at the graduate level—not as a means of satisfying certification requirements but as a device for providing teachers who already hold undergraduate student-teaching credit an opportunity for classroom experience under observation and supervision at an advanced level. Southern Illinois University has developed a selective internship program open to a few of the most promising graduate students. These students are placed in approved school systems in the Carbondale area. The interns are looked upon as the future leaders of education in southern Illinois. The English staff at Bowling Green State University teaches a required graduate course in research and writing. Iowa State Teachers College has provided advisory committees for its graduate students rather than the single adviser commonly found elsewhere. Mixed reaction was encountered to the advisory program. Some thought it was not working as planned. Some thought it could not be continued as the pressure of larger enrollments be-

gan to be felt. One staff member was enthusiastic and thought everything possible should be done to continue it.

SUMMER GRADUATE PROGRAMS

The pressure of the enrollment of teachers and administrators is felt in our graduate schools during the summer session when teacher training institutions become graduate teacher training institutions. Many schools shift from liberal arts to teacher education institutions during the summer months. Dean Walter R. Horlacher, of Colorado A&M College, made a study of summer enrollments in the Rocky Mountain region. He reported that between 33 percent and 68 percent of the students were in the graduate school (this includes only those schools having established graduate programs). He also found that 65 percent to 100 percent of the graduate enrollments consisted of students specializing in Education.¹ A similar trend was reported in the ten institutions visited during this study. As a valid generalization it can be assumed that half of the summer enrollment will be graduate students although the graduate enrollment may not be more than one-fifth or one-fourth of the total enrollment during the regular academic year.

The increased importance of the graduate school during the summer session has brought all institutions similar problems. It was observed that the Education staff was heavily loaded with graduate courses, many of which had large enrollments. A companion problem was the disappointingly small enrollments in many courses offered outside Education. Summer directors have a continuing problem of dealing with departments whose offerings are not attractive to teachers and administrators.

One solution to this problem is to add visiting professors to the staff in the

areas in which teachers and administrators are interested. Visiting professors are not expected to give much service outside the classroom, although they occasionally help with final oral examinations. Those institutions which grant summer leaves have a special problem to face. It is difficult to handle students whose advisers are not on campus. The problem of lack of continuity of summer staff is recognized in several of the ten institutions covered in this study.

Two other solutions to the pressure on the Education staff have been observed. One institution cut the teaching load of all regular staff members to release their time for directing research, advising graduate students, and serving on thesis committees. Another institution has worked out an arrangement for transferring funds from other departments to the department of Education for the summer session only, thereby supplementing the funds available for hiring visiting staff members.

The foregoing are two most difficult problems for the summer director: hiring additional members of the Educa-

tion staff—every institution is expanding in the same direction—and dealing with unpopular courses and departments. Areas which prove too unpopular cannot be continued in the summer program. Departments seeking to attract additional students have found that courses tailor-made for teachers and administrators greatly increased their drawing power. This was especially true in courses in the teaching of subject-matter.

It seems clear that present policies of summer leaves are not adequate in those departments which primarily serve teachers and administrators. A well executed program of sabbatical leaves would seem to have a vital role in helping staff members to prepare to meet the challenge of teaching graduate students during the summer months. It seems wise that staff members who are responsible for graduate programs for teachers and administrators should not be given leave during the summer months.

How to upgrade a staff which is primarily concerned with undergraduate instruction during the regular year is

¹ From Horlacher's report to summer school directors of the Rocky Mountain Region cited on p. 214:

Summary (1954)

Institution	Summer Enrollment	Percent Graduate	Percent Graduate Enrolled in Education
University of Colorado	5,832	48	75
Colorado State College of Education	2,845	60	100
Western State College (Colorado)	898	52	89
Colorado A & M College	1,230	61	76
University of Wyoming	1,520	53	66
Adams State College*	405	14	100
Brigham Young University	2,140	34	80
Montana State University	1,002	58	65
Montana State College†	505	68	17
University of Denver	3,391	47	75
Western New Mexico College	587	30	100
Colorado School of Mines	400	00	00

* Graduate program not yet recognized by North Central Association.

† Master of Education degree was new (1954).

recognized as a real problem but most summer directors agreed that the responsibility for meeting this need lies primarily with the individual staff member. Suitable leave policies and group conferences might be helpful but the individual staff member will have to do the job himself. Since many teachers and administrators can be evaluated only in terms of their performance in graduate courses, the staff member who does not adjust his teaching methods and grading standards to the greater maturity of his students will fail to that extent in maintaining the graduate nature of his course work. If the graduate courses are not truly graduate in nature the graduate degrees given will not be truly graduate degrees either.

GRADUATE EXTENSION PROGRAMS

Paralleling the growth of summer graduate programs is the expansion of graduate work for teachers in night school and off-campus courses. Such offerings are frequently planned in co-operation with public school systems as in-service training programs. One of the institutions visited offers almost all its graduate work after four o'clock. Most of its graduate and many of its undergraduate students are part-time. A few institutions located in smaller cities have organized graduate courses on campus at night or on Saturday. Where this practice was found it was assumed that the quality of the work done on campus was higher than the work which would be done in a similar course given off campus. Several staff members are not convinced that the quality of such courses was any higher when given on campus. They feel that the time and energy the student consumed in travel offset any theoretical advantage of studying in an academic atmosphere.

Most of the ten institutions covered

in this study offer graduate courses in organized extension centers or in co-operation with local public school systems. In 1945 a committee of the American Association of Universities recommended that not more than two-fifths of the credit for the master's degree should be earned in extension or at off-campus centers.¹ Where transfer of graduate credits is permitted they come within the same recommendation. One multi-purpose institution with several graduate extension centers permits all except one summer of the master's degree in Education to be earned in these centers. Smaller institutions usually restrict off-campus and transfer credit combined from one-fourth to one-third of the total program. One institution permits only one-sixth of the work for the Master of Education degree to be done by extension.

Many graduate students are served by extension programs. One multiple-purpose institution reported that from 30 percent to 40 percent of its extension enrollments are graduate enrollments. One institution in the Rocky Mountain area reported that 10 percent of its extension enrollments are graduate enrollments. Two recently established graduate programs in the Midwest were found in institutions where 10 percent and 20 percent of the extension enrollments were on the graduate level. The number of graduate students in extension courses is increasing in absolute numbers as well as in relation to total extension enrollments.

Almost every institution visited is anxious to maintain the quality of off-campus work. Several have well-organized extension libraries with adequate holdings. In at least one case,

¹ "The Master's Degrees," *Journal of Proceedings*, American Association of Universities (Preprint), 1945, pp. 9-10.

graduate students felt they received better library service on off-campus courses. One institution urges its off-campus students to visit the campus to consult their graduate advisers about their off-campus programs. Another institution sends graduate advisers to extension centers to aid graduate students in planning their work. At least two institutions have studied their grading standards in off-campus courses and found that they compare favorably with those on campus.

GRADUATE GRADES

An unsystematic survey of graduate grades in the institutions visited supports the conclusion that A and B are the characteristic graduate grades. The grade of C or equivalent is rarely given. Students admitted to graduate programs for teachers and administrators are unlikely to be eliminated because their grades are unsatisfactory. The requirement of a B average for admission to candidacy or for granting the master's degree does not serve as a reliable means of eliminating undesirable or unqualified degree applicants. The percentage of unsatisfactory graduate grades in the six schools which admit all bachelor's degree holders was found no higher than in those institutions which are more selective in admitting

teachers and administrators to their graduate programs.¹

The systems of graduate grades at Wayne University and the University of Michigan are of some interest. Since approximately 90 percent of all graduate grades are A and B, these institutions have developed a means of making graduate grades more discriminating. Wayne University has the following graduate grades: Honor, Pass, Pass Weak, and Unsatisfactory. I could not find any evidence that the grade, Pass Weak, was much used. The system at the University of Michigan includes +'s and -'s for A, B, and C. Point values are assigned to each grade: 9 to A+, and so on with 1 for C-. The requirements for the master's degree include a 5-point (clear B) average. The officials of the Graduate School at the University of Michigan are well enough satisfied with the system to recommend it to others. Some of the staff members at the University feel that it is not possible to make the fine distinctions required by their grade system. The system does make it possible for those teaching graduate students to attempt a more discriminating judgment of each graduate student. No break-down of graduate grades was available to show the frequency with which the plus and minus

¹ Summary of grade distributions from several of the ten institutions visited during the summer of 1954:

Type of Courses	Percent			
	A	B	C	Other
Large institution, all grades	41	51	4	6
Ditto, Education grades	31	59	5	4
Multiple-purpose, Ed. courses ^a	35	60	4	4
Teacher-training, all courses	29	64	7	1, 2
Large institution, Ed. courses ^a	50	43	3	4 ^b
Multiple-purpose, Ed. courses ^a	36	57	2.4	5 ^c
Multiple-purpose, Ed. courses ^a	28	58	(2% B-)	12 ^d

^a Institutions with restrictive policies of admissions.

^b Covers a ten-year period.

^c 1947-48.

^d Summer, 1953.

signs were actually used by those teaching graduate courses. A grade-point of 6 to 7 is considered satisfactory for graduate work beyond the master's degree. This is a B+ to A— average. The evidence from grade reports at this institution is that the three lower grades, C+, C, and C— are not much used, especially in Education courses.

CONCLUSION

The opinion was encountered that the fifth-year program for teachers is a professional program and should be in the department or school of Education rather than in the graduate school. This would imply the issuance of a professional degree to replace the master's degree. One does not have to assume that the fifth-year program for teachers is better or worse than a master's degree program but only that it is different. Many institutions approximate this judgment by giving the master's degree for teachers a different name, often the Master of Education.

Mixed reactions have been received from those who have read this report. It has been suggested that I should view with alarm the prostitution of the graduate school. One letter suggested that the fifth-year program should be

evaluated in terms of improved teachers and better teaching rather than in terms of language and thesis requirements. One respondent suggested that the small graduate school can still preserve research in the master's program since its staff does not supervise doctoral work. Some recommend stressing inventiveness rather than conventional graduate work. One reaction was that considerable screening takes place in approving teachers and administrators for admission to candidacy, even if such screening occurs at the time of admission to graduate school.

It seems clear to me after talking to over one hundred of those who are responsible for our graduate programs for teachers and administrators that the fifth-year program is considered a graduate program and that the master's degree is almost universally awarded as a consequence. State laws and school policy are drafted in terms of the master's degree as the fifth year of teacher-training. I conclude that we shall continue to offer the fifth year of training for teachers and administrators as part of our graduate program and to award the master's degree at its conclusion probably without either a thesis or a foreign language as a requirement.

CARL A. JESSEN, *Former Secretary, The Cooperative Study*

Cooperative Study of Secondary-School Standards After Twenty-One Years¹

WHEN AN INDIVIDUAL or an organization reaches the ripe age of twenty-one, it is probably time to do some appraising. By that time childhood diseases and the growing pains of adolescence are things of the past, and the individual—or the organization—may reasonably be expected to have reached a certain amount of maturity, a certain amount of stability. We are twenty-one.

Your organization is approximately the same age as ours. I know because I had a small hand in its beginnings. During the intervening years you have done a masterful job with evaluating the progress of individual pupils. We of the Cooperative Study have during those same years been engaged in developing techniques and procedures for the evaluation of schools. It is time that we take counsel together.

The Cooperative Study is a creature of the regional associations of colleges and secondary schools. The committee in charge is made up of representatives named by the associations of colleges and secondary schools in New England, Middle Atlantic, North Central, Southern, and Northwest areas. These are the responsible agents. They have elected to associate with themselves a number of advisory members. The

membership of the committee at present totals twenty with four advisory members.

ACCREDITING

When the Cooperative Study of Secondary-School Standards came into being in 1933, there were numerous criticisms of the accrediting system. There always have been. I shall not here deal with the shortcomings of accrediting; that job is adequately done by the critics. All I will say is that those having charge of accrediting in the regional associations are fully aware of those shortcomings—probably more aware of them than the outside critics. The regional associations were aware of the difficulties back in 1933. It was precisely this awareness which caused them to join in a cooperative effort to improve their accrediting standards and procedures by forming an organization which made its debut under the resounding name of the Committee for the Cooperative Study of Secondary-School Standards and Accrediting Procedures. The briefer name by which we are now known was a later development.

We started, then, with the objective of bringing study and research to bear upon the problems of accrediting in order that the standards and the procedures of accrediting might be improved. We have never relaxed our efforts in this regard; it is still one of our

¹ Reprinted by permission. This address was originally published in *Education in a Free World*, published by the American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.

prime objectives. The accrediting action, if exercised at all, is a function of the parent organizations; we of the Cooperative Study point the way toward more effective procedures of evaluating secondary schools that apply for accrediting.

As our deliberations and experimentation progressed, this thought kept cropping up time and again: Ought not our evaluating instruments and procedures lead to continuous and progressive improvement of schools rather than merely to bring schools up on a plateau which would be acceptable for accrediting purposes? What kind of techniques could we develop which would be stimulating and helpful in making a good school even a better school? To the original purpose of better accrediting we added the purpose of better schools whether or not accrediting was contemplated. Our efforts in this direction, too, have never been relaxed.

CHECKLISTS

It was about this time that we introduced checklist items into the processes with which we were working. These consist of affirmative statements concerning the equipment and practices of the school. They have been drawn largely from educational literature and are the fruits of an extensive analysis of educational research studies—an analysis which it took more than a year to complete. Through donated help from eighteen leaders of research in fourteen different institutions and assistance from numerous graduate students, we assembled abstracts of more than twenty-five hundred educational research studies having a bearing on accrediting and the improvement of secondary schools generally. These twenty-five hundred abstracts and the studies themselves were worked over by the research staff of the Cooperative

Study and formed the basis for the checklist items which have always been prominent in our evaluative instruments.

The analysis to which I have just alluded brought out clearly a feature which has become a "must" in our evaluative instruments. Up to that time, standards for accrediting had to a large extent concerned themselves with facilities. Did the school have a well-stocked library? Did the teachers of academic subjects have a specified number of semester hours of training? Was the school plant adequate to house faculty and students? The literature which we analyzed, however, emphasized not only the presence of a well-stocked library, but the use made of that library by students and teachers. It was not only a matter of education of teachers but how effective the teachers were as instructors and guides for youth. The school plant might be wonderful, but what use was being made of it? Our checklist items have a double purpose: (1) to determine what facilities are present; (2) to ascertain what use is being made of those facilities.

Lest the impression be left that the checklist items alone supply all the information secured about a school, it should be said that the Cooperative Study provides a variety of devices by which a given school may catalogue its equipment and practices—reports, records, comments, statements on outcomes or special characteristics, and improvements planned or in progress. Our effort has been to provide opportunity for a comprehensive inventory of what a school is trying to do, what facilities it has for doing its job, and how well it uses its facilities.

EVALUATIONS

This leads directly into another principal feature of our technique, namely,

evaluational items. Just as the checklist items are there to give an accurate portrayal of facilities and their use, so the evaluational items provide a means for rendering judgments on the effectiveness of the school's operation. Those judgments are all the more likely to be correct, since the evaluation items follow immediately after the checklist items and are usually on the same page with them.

The person filling in the factual information called for by the checklist items does so by indicating whether a certain feature is present or operating in an outstanding way, is just average, or is very much limited—a three-point scale. Anyone undertaking to make evaluations, however, is required to be more discriminatory. The evaluational items are generally in question form and usually begin with how effective, how adequate, how extensive, how satisfactory, to what degree, how well, how up-to-date, how accessible, how comprehensive, or some similar interrogation. The evaluator is asked to respond on a five-point scale.

That scale itself is interesting. The definitions of the various ratings are geared to the two fundamentals already commented on in the checklist items, namely, (1) the presence of a facility, and (2) the use made of it. Naturally the highest possible rating goes to the school that has provided a given facility to an unusual extent and uses it to the greatest advantage. At the other end of the scale is the school which has little to work with and utilizes indifferently the little it has. The middle rating goes to the school which is ordinary, or average, if you prefer that term, both in its provision of the given facility and in its use of it. There is an intermediate rating between the average and the highest point on the scale; a school qualities for this next-to-the-highest rating in one of two ways—

its provision for the facility is excellent but its use of it is merely ordinary, or, its provision of the facility is ordinary but its utilization of what it has is extraordinary. Similarly there is an intermediate rating between poor and average; this is reserved for the school which for any given facility provides ordinarily well but utilizes poorly, or although making inadequate provision uses what it has to good advantage.

SELF-EVALUATION AND COMMITTEE EVALUATION

Many of you may have been present at discussions of the relative merits of self-evaluation and visiting-committee evaluation. It may interest you to know that the plan for double evaluation—self-evaluation followed by visiting-committee evaluation—was a development which came later than the checklist concept.

The germ of visiting-committee evaluation was present in the system followed by several of the regional associations, namely, to expect a state committee to make recommendations regarding the accrediting of any and all schools applying for accrediting from that state. We of the Cooperative Study expanded the idea of evaluation by an outside committee and provided the means for a more thoroughgoing check than formerly; this more thoroughgoing check came about through the use of the checklists and evaluations already described. In order to conserve the time of the visiting committee, we evolved a plan under which the faculty of the school to be evaluated would, in advance of the evaluation by the visiting committee, fill in the checklist items. The local faculty might also find it stimulating to fill in the evaluational items.

I do not want to leave the impression that we stumbled onto self-evaluation. Certainly we were not unaware

of the value of self-appraisal. Several of us had worked on school surveys and had experienced some of the values to be gained from self-surveys. But I think I am correct in saying that not one of us sensed the enormous potential of self-evaluation. There are those who tell us now that the principal value to be gained from an evaluation with the Cooperative Study instruments comes from the self-evaluation—that a self-evaluation with our instruments is the most stimulating educational experience a school faculty and a community can have.

Our own judgment is that, important as self-evaluation is, it is desirable to follow it with evaluation by a committee from outside. Such an outside committee frequently sees possibilities not discerned by those close to the problem; or it may give a boost to a desirable objective not otherwise attainable. Also the visiting committee may at times exert a sobering influence on a too-exultant appraisal by local enthusiasts. So we advocate the double appraisal—self-evaluation first, followed by visiting-committee evaluation.

The Pattern

These features—self-evaluation and visiting-committee evaluation through application of checklist items and evaluation items, plus another feature, namely, guiding principles, which I have omitted from my discussion because of time considerations—these features make up the basic pattern followed in evaluations with Cooperative Study instruments and procedures. They were present in the 1940 edition, they are in the 1950 edition, and a discussion which took place last week among members of our General Committee indicated that they are likely to be found in the next instrument which we develop.

THE 1950 REVISION

The Cooperative Study's *Evaluative Criteria* has gone through one revision and another is in contemplation. The first revision came ten years after appearance of the original edition. It is inevitable that instruments of evaluation in a field so dynamic and changing as secondary education become outdated and must be revised from time to time.

The 1950 edition of the *Evaluative Criteria*, while holding fast to fundamentals such as self-evaluation, committee evaluation, guiding principles, and checklist and evaluation items, is notably different from the 1940 edition.

It is true that six sections, namely, Pupil Population and School Community, Pupil Activity Program, Library Service, Guidance Service, School Plant, and Data for Individual Staff Members appear in both editions under those titles. Naturally there is much similarity in the organization and treatment of these areas, but also there is much change introduced, as witness the fact that not one page of the original could be salvaged for reproduction in the 1950 edition. This revision was no mere tinkering job. It was a thoroughly creative revision in which nothing was retained except as it had proved itself useful in evaluations during the years from 1940 to 1947. During those eight years the Cooperative Study assembled and tabulated evidence and judgments from evaluated schools and from persons having experience with the *Evaluative Criteria* in one way or another. These hundreds of reactions coming from those who had experiences with the *Evaluative Criteria* in action plus a thorough canvass of the educational literature which had appeared in the interval between the two editions gave us at the outset a twofold approach to the problems of revision.

Another technique which was followed to get composite judgment into the revision ought to be mentioned. In each of the areas we had what we called juries. These juries were made up of specialists in the various areas. All told, we had approximately one hundred and fifty persons serving on those juries. The function of a given jury, in science for instance, was to advise with our research staff as the work of revision progressed. Especially were the jury members asked to review and react to the manuscripts produced in order that their viewpoints would not be overlooked when we were getting ready to send materials to the printer.

I have mentioned six areas in which we paralleled the organization of the earlier edition closely enough to retain the titles unchanged. There were other areas, however, where the experience with the 1940 edition clearly indicated that more fundamental modifications were necessary.

The curriculum was such an area. In the 1940 edition we had attempted to deal with the curriculum and instruction in three sections, one on the offerings, another on instruction, and a third on outcomes. In the revision, the treatment of the curriculum and instruction was greatly expanded, seventeen sections taking the place of the original three. One of those new sections is on the program of studies. The other sixteen are on the various subject areas found in high school instruction; each of these sections includes subsections on instruction and outcomes as well as other information pertinent to an understanding of the nature, purposes, and results of instruction in that subject area.

The reporting and summary of findings have also undergone extensive modification in the 1950 edition. Gone are the "educational temperatures" of the original edition, percentile scales,

regional norms, the beta and gamma scales, and the lengthy directions accompanying them. In their places we have arithmetical means and bar graphs for summarizing and making understandable the results of an evaluation.

As may be surmised, the section on objectives, or Needs of Youth, has proved more difficult than any other. It has been an often reiterated purpose of the Cooperative Study to develop practical means and methods for evaluating a school in terms of what the school is trying to accomplish. It therefore is of paramount importance to find out what the school is trying to do—what its objectives are. Our early efforts were not too effective in this regard. Often what we got was the seven objectives of the *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, or the *Ten Imperative Needs of Youth*, or some similarly excellent and authoritative statement of what should be the aims and objectives of secondary education. Too often there was no evidence that the school had developed a philosophy of its own or had given any serious thought to objectives. We usually looked in vain for specific goals of the school within the general framework of the broader purposes of education. Faced with this problem we have tried in various ways to help the individual school present a clear statement on what goals it is striving for and how far along it is in achieving each of those goals. Our success has been far from what we desire. We welcome suggestions particularly in this field.

EVALUATION BASED ON SCIENTIFIC DATA

Our endeavor is to recommend procedures which are as scientific as possible without being too ponderous. The last-named feature is highly important. We frequently receive suggestions for far-reaching expansions. Persons who

are deeply interested in some specialized field often tell us that the part of the instrument which touches their specialty is inadequate. Usually when we ask them to carry their thought a little further they come forth with proposals which would require pages upon pages of extra space. This is understandable if one is thinking only of one area. If one is thinking of a comprehensive evaluation of an entire school—and we are thinking in those terms—then the proposal becomes impracticable. If all sections were materially expanded, we would soon have an instrument so massive that it would fall of its own weight; no one would find the time to use it.

However, the idea of bringing more and more scientific background into our undertakings is inviting. We thought at one time in the late 1930's that results of standardized tests administered to pupils might help in making evaluations of schools more valid. After spending about \$25,000 on testing programs we gave up on this idea for the time being. The difficulty came when we attempted to translate the evaluation of individual pupil achievement into something tangible about the efficiency of the school.

We gathered data on the success of graduates. But, how does one interpret data on the success of individual graduates so as to get something meaningful about the success of the school? Oh, I know that we all tend to form judgments based on these and other features of any given school, but what I am asking now is, How do we translate these somewhat intangible and frequently isolated data into a defensible scientific finding about the effectiveness of the school?

Yes, we would like to evaluate on the basis of results scientifically ascertained. Some of you who have worked more consistently than we have with

testing programs may be able to show us the way. Certainly evaluation of schools by every-pupil test results in the several objectives of education—or even in only some of them—is a vision that we do not easily relinquish. And probably it is not so visionary after all. You folks engaged in testing get some wonderful results.

EVALUATING THE PROCESS

For ourselves, not knowing just how to judge schools scientifically on their results, we have centered much of our attention on the equipment and processes of secondary education—the facilities available and the use made of them. Here we think we are on safe ground—ground that has been seeded by educational literature and cultivated by experiment and experience.

Right here I want to pay my respects to judgment based on information and grounded in experience. No matter how scientific one attempts to be, no matter how many scientifically treated data are collected, ultimately someone is called in to consider the evidence and render the final judgment. We of the Cooperative Study assemble information regarding the school principally from those who know the school best, namely, the faculty. We are desirous of having that information as factual and objective and standardized as possible. But we have no plan to eliminate the weighing of that information—the evaluation of what the data mean—by persons of good judgment and extensive educational experience comprising a visiting committee.

ACCEPTANCE

The members of the committee in charge of the Cooperative Study have worked diligently to make the *Evaluative Criteria* a practical instrument for the evaluation of secondary schools. Their supervision of the undertakings

has been systematic and painstaking. In preparing both the original edition and the revision, the members themselves scrutinized the materials carefully before approving them for release.

The result is an instrument which has brought forth high praise from those who have used it through the years. The volume of sales of the present edition has gone far beyond our estimates and is continuing to astonish us.

The members of the committee are agreed that the procedures and materials evolved by the Cooperative Study must be kept up-to-date through constant examination and periodic revision. Already consideration is being given to the problem of what should be

the nature of the next instrument of evaluation. At a meeting held near the middle of October, 1954, the General Committee approved plans for the systematic assembly of reactions regarding the content and procedures of evaluations from schools being evaluated and from individuals serving on visiting committees. We are also planning field visits for the purpose of securing reactions and viewpoints through conference and observation. The next instrument will have to be better than its predecessors. In that direction lies progress. We solicit and welcome suggestions for refinements and improvements in the content of the *Evaluative Criteria* and in the procedures for their application.

Treasurer's Report for the Fiscal Year

July 1, 1954-June 30, 1955

THE TREASURER submits the following audit of his accounts for the fiscal year, July 1, 1954 to June 30, 1955, as reported by Koeneman, Borger, Krouse & Dinius, Certified Public Accountants of Fort Wayne, Indiana. For several years this firm has been retained by the North Central Association to maintain a perpetual audit of the books and records maintained at the treasurer's office. The following audit is dated June 30, 1955.

In keeping with sound business practice, the Association carries a \$40,000 bond for the treasurer and another of \$10,000 for his secretary.

INDEX

AUDITOR'S REPORT

Report Letter:

Scope of Examination
Comments on Balance Sheet
Comments on Activities

Balance Sheet, June 30, 1955.....
Statement of Changes in Fund Balances for the years ended June 30, 1955 and June 30, 1954.....

Exhibit
"A"

"B"

Statement of Income and Expense—General Fund for the years ended June 30, 1955 and June 30, 1954.....
Statement of Expense for the years ended June 30, 1955 and June 30, 1954.....

Schedule
"B-1"
"B-2"

July 26, 1955

Mr. R. Nelson Snider, Treasurer
North Central Association of Colleges
and Secondary Schools
Fort Wayne, Indiana

SCOPE OF EXAMINATION

Our examination was confined to an audit of the cash receipts and disbursements of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as recorded by the Treasurer for the year ended June 30, 1955. In addition to working funds shown, the Association is said to own certain unrecorded other assets consisting principally of office equipment at various offices. No attempt was made to determine the amount or value of this equipment.

In our opinion, subject to the representations of the secretaries of the revolving funds as to balances controlled by them, the accompanying balance sheet and statement of changes in fund balances present fairly the financial position of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as at June 30, 1955, and the results of its financial operations for the year then ended in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

KOENEMAN, BORGER, KROUSE & DINIUS
Certified Public Accountants

COMMENTS ON BALANCE SHEET

Cash on deposit—\$49,715.18

The cash on deposit was verified directly with the depositories as at June 30, 1955, and the amounts reported to us were reconciled with the following balances:

The Peoples Trust and Savings Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana.....	\$23,443.23
Lincoln National Bank and Trust Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana.....	16,007.57
Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company of Chicago, Illinois.....	5,000.00
South Holland Trust and Savings Bank, South Holland, Illinois.....	5,264.38
	<hr/>
	\$49,715.18
	<hr/>

Copies of the official receipts for cash received by the Treasurer were traced to the proper cash records and to the record of deposits in the banks. The returned paid checks were inspected and the vouchers authorizing cash disbursements were properly approved and recorded.

The cash on deposit includes \$12,177.14 belonging to the Liberal Arts and Education Study account, and \$7,870.00 belonging to the account of the sub-committee on Institutions for Teachers' Education.

Due from United States Armed Forces Institute of Technology—\$3,209.90

The foregoing amount is due from the federal government for reimbursement of expenses in connection with studies made by the Association's Defense Committee.

Balance due, July 1, 1954.....	\$ 2,953.29
Expenses incurred during the year.....	15,802.40
	<hr/>
	\$18,755.69
Cash payments received.....	15,545.79
	<hr/>
Balance Due, June 30, 1955.....	\$ 3,209.90
	<hr/>

Revolving funds with Secretaries of Commissions—\$1,563.63

The balances in the revolving funds held by the Secretaries of Commissions and the "Quarterly" office were verified by examining their reports as of June 30, 1955, as made to the Treasurer of the Association.

Disbursements from the revolving funds are reported periodically by the Secretaries in charge of the funds. The funds are reimbursed by the Treasurer in accordance with the reports submitted.

The following amounts were reported as of June 30, 1955:

Dr. Charles W. Boardman, Secretary North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.....	\$ 260.54
Mr. Norman Burns, Secretary Commission on Colleges and Universities.....	494.54
Mr. A. J. Gibson, Secretary Commission on Secondary Schools.....	121.33
Dr. Harlan C. Koch, Managing Editor North Central Association Quarterly.....	687.22
	<hr/>
	\$1,563.63
	<hr/>

Liberal Arts Education Study—\$12,177.14

Exhibit "B" presents the changes to the Liberal Arts Education Study Fund for the year ended June 30, 1955. The amounts paid out of this fund exceeded the income by \$5,244.82, and this amount deducted from the fund balance at July 1, 1954 reduces the fund balance to \$12,177.14, at June 30, 1955. The fund balance is represented by cash on deposit.

Institutions for Teachers' Education—\$7,870.00

The cash received for Institutions for Teachers' Education is carried as a fund balance and accordingly is not included in the income of the general fund. During the year ended June 30, 1955 the cash collections were less than the expenditures by \$150.00 making the fund balance \$7,870.00 at June 30, 1955.

General Fund-\$32,862.04

The general fund balance was increased \$9,705.29 for the year ended June 30, 1955. This amount represents the excess of the income over the expenses as presented in Schedule "B-1."

The balance in the general fund at June 30, 1955 is composed as follows:

Cash on deposit.....	\$29,668.04
Due from United States Armed Forces Institute of Technology.....	3,209.90
	<hr/>
	\$32,877.94
<i>Less:</i> Dues paid in advance.....	15.00
	<hr/>
	\$32,862.94

COMMENTS ON ACTIVITIES

The general fund net income for the current year was \$8,409.18 lower than the previous year. After excluding the Defense Committee's income and expense, the total income is \$5,771.13 greater than last year and the expenses are \$14,180.31 greater than last year.

A condensed summary of the income and expense in comparative form for the last five years is as follows:

	Year Ended June 30				
	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951
<i>Income:</i>					
Membership dues.....	\$112,165.00	\$109,780.00	\$57,552.50	\$56,857.50	\$55,330.02
Application fees.....	1,140.00	1,105.00	420.00	570.00	700.00
Inspection and survey fees	15,955.40	11,262.30	15,500.00	7,786.38	16,382.86
Registration fees.....	—	—	—	2,688.00	1,385.00
Sale of Quarterlies.....	1,520.66	1,672.82	1,422.17	1,471.27	1,157.14
Sale of manuals and schedules.....	304.75	304.50	286.29	285.34	270.47
Sale of Form A-3.....	.10	695.22	2,853.82	—	1,621.44
Royalties, reprints and miscellaneous.....	869.31	1,364.25	993.01	1,839.02	1,728.78
United States Armed Forces Institute of Technology.....	15,802.40	30,069.07	2,899.07	—	—
<i>Total Income.....</i>	<u>\$147,757.62</u>	<u>\$156,253.16</u>	<u>\$81,926.86</u>	<u>\$71,497.51</u>	<u>\$78,575.71</u>
<i>Expenses.....</i>	<u>138,052.33</u>	<u>138,138.69</u>	<u>90,008.85</u>	<u>75,501.42</u>	<u>77,022.78</u>
<i>Excess of Income Over Expense.....</i>	<u>\$ 9,705.29</u>	<u>\$ 18,114.47</u>	<u>\$(8,081.99)</u>	<u>\$(4,003.91)</u>	<u>\$ 1,552.93</u>

The details of the general fund income and expenses for the years ended June 30, 1955 and June 30, 1954 are shown in Schedule "B-1." Further details of the expenses are presented in Schedule "B-2."

As of June 30, 1955 the Treasurer of the Association was bonded in the amount of \$10,000.00, and the Treasurer's secretary was bonded in the amount of \$5,000.00.

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR

229

Exhibit "A"

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS
 R. NELSON SNIDER, TREASURER
 BALANCE SHEET, JUNE 30, 1955

ASSETS

Cash:

On deposit.....	\$49,715.18
Due from United States Armed Forces Institute of Technology.....	3,209.90
Revolving funds with Secretaries of Commissions.....	1,563.63
	<hr/>
Total Working Funds.....	\$54,488.71
	<hr/>
Total Assets.....	\$54,488.71
	<hr/>

FUND BALANCES AND LIABILITIES

Membership dues paid in advance.....	\$ 15.00
Liberal Arts Education Study.....	12,177.14
Institute for Teachers' Education.....	7,870.00
Revolving funds—Secretaries of Commissions.....	1,563.63

General Fund:

Balance, July 1, 1954.....	\$23,157.65
Add: Excess of income over expenses for the year ended June 30, 1955 (Schedule "B-1").....	9,705.29
	<hr/>
Total Fund Balances and Liabilities.....	\$54,488.71
	<hr/>

Exhibit "B"

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS
 R. NELSON SNIDER, TREASURER
 STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES
 FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 1955 AND JUNE 30, 1954

	Balance July 1	Income	Total	Expense	Balance June 30
<i>June 30, 1955:</i>					
Liberal Arts Education Study.....	\$17,421.96	\$ 12,975.46	\$ 30,397.42	\$ 18,220.28	\$12,177.14
Institutions for Teachers' Education.....	8,020.00	3,210.00	11,230.00	3,360.00	7,870.00
General Fund.....	23,157.65	147,757.62	170,915.27	138,052.33	32,862.94
<i>Total</i>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$48,599.61	\$163,943.08	\$212,542.69	\$159,632.61	\$52,910.08

June 30, 1954:

Liberal Arts Education Study.....	\$16,209.93	\$ 16,908.00	\$ 33,117.93	\$ 15,695.97	\$17,421.96
Institutions for Teachers' Education.....	7,575.00	4,870.00	12,445.00	4,425.00	8,020.00
General Fund.....	5,043.18	156,253.16	161,296.34	138,138.09	23,157.65
<i>Total</i>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$28,828.11	\$178,031.16	\$206,859.27	\$158,259.66	\$48,599.61

Schedule "B-1"

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

R. NELSON SNIDER—TREASURER

STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENSE—GENERAL FUND

FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 1955 AND JUNE 30, 1954

	Year Ended June 30, 1955	Year Ended June 30, 1954	Increase (Decrease)
<i>Income:</i>			
<i>Membership Dues:</i>			
Universities and colleges.....	\$ 59,070.00	\$ 58,095.00	\$ 975.00
Junior colleges.....	3,575.00	3,445.00	130.00
Secondary schools.....	49,035.00	48,240.00	795.00
Delinquent dues collected.....	485.00	—	485.00
	<u>\$112,165.00</u>	<u>\$109,780.00</u>	<u>\$ 2,385.00</u>
Application fees.....	1,140.00	1,105.00	35.00
Inspection and survey fees.....	15,955.40	11,262.30	4,693.10
	<u>\$129,260.40</u>	<u>\$122,147.30</u>	<u>\$ 7,113.10</u>

Other Income:

Sale of Quarterlies.....	\$ 1,520.66	\$ 1,672.82	\$(152.16)
Sale of manuals and schedules.....	304.75	304.50	.25
Sale of Form A-3.....	.10	695.22	(695.12)
Royalties, reprints, faculty record blanks and miscellaneous income.....	869.31	1,364.25	(494.94)
United States Armed Forces Institute of Technology.....	15,802.40	30,069.07	(14,266.67)
	<u>\$18,497.22</u>	<u>\$ 34,105.86</u>	<u>\$(15,608.64)</u>
Total Other Income.....			
	<u>\$147,757.62</u>	<u>\$156,253.16</u>	<u>\$(8,495.54)</u>

Expense (Schedule "B-2"):

Commission on Research and Service.....	\$ 5,132.07	\$ 5,433.75	\$(301.68)
Commission on Secondary Schools.....	22,800.02	21,581.78	1,218.24
Commission on Colleges and Universities.....	38,504.67	35,757.98	2,746.60
Executive Committee.....	2,648.25	2,388.57	259.68
Television Committee.....	333.02	471.31	(138.29)
Public Relations Committee.....	1,445.87	2,732.60	(1,286.73)
Reorganization Committee.....	421.76	813.45	(391.69)
Publicity Committee.....	2,598.73	1,194.84	1,403.89
President's office.....	500.00	366.13	133.87
Defense Committee.....	15,802.40	30,069.07	(14,266.67)
Quarterly office.....	10,859.34	11,420.57	(561.23)
Secretary's office.....	10,572.08	4,257.76	6,314.32
Treasurer's office.....	2,867.35	2,642.01	225.34
General Association.....	9,382.95	8,692.50	690.45
Other.....	14,183.82	10,316.37	3,867.45
	<u>\$138,052.33</u>	<u>\$138,138.69</u>	<u>\$(86.36)</u>
Total Expense.....			
	<u>\$9,705.29</u>	<u>\$ 18,114.47</u>	<u>\$(8,409.18)</u>

Net Income.....

Schedule "B-2"

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS
 R. NELSON SNIDER, TREASURER
 STATEMENT OF EXPENSE

FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 1955 AND JUNE 30, 1954

	Year Ended June 30, 1955	Year Ended June 30, 1954	Increase (Decrease)
--	--------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------

Commission on Research and Service:

Steering committee.....	\$ 572.86	\$ 505.24	\$ 67.72
Committee on experimental units.....	582.79	221.24	361.55

Committee on Teacher Education:

Directing Committee.....	647.46	663.77	(16.31)
Liberal Arts Committee.....	600.00	933.60	(333.60)
In-Service Education Committee.....	357.54	680.96	(323.42)
Institutions for Teacher Education Committee.....	599.98	609.29	(9.31)
Multi-Purpose Institutions Committee.....	31.35	540.92	(509.57)
Council on Cooperation	50.00	50.00	—
Library Study Committee	408.94	662.93	(253.99)

Committee on Current Educational Problems:

Reading improvements.....	609.68	—	609.68
High school and college articulation.....	536.75	—	536.75
Social experiences and organizations.....	134.72	357.76	(223.04)
Military information and orientation.....	—	208.04	(208.04)

Total.....	\$ 5,132.07	\$ 5,433.75	\$(301.68)
------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

*Commission on Secondary Schools:**Secretary's Office:*

Salary.....	\$ 3,797.91	\$ 3,600.00	\$ 197.91
Office expense.....	500.00	500.00	—
State Committee Chairmen meeting.....	4,455.72	3,326.21	1,129.51
Secretarial assistance at Chicago.....	131.05	143.19	(12.14)
Office of chairman	500.00	500.00	—
State Committees.....	9,750.26	9,423.83	326.43
Administrative Committee.....	1,857.20	1,985.63	(128.43)

Committee of the Commission:

Cooperating committee on Research.....	—	807.46	(807.46)
Activities Committee.....	600.00	516.17	83.83
Committee on Dependents' Schools.....	900.00	600.00	300.00
Report Forms Committee.....	307.88	179.29	128.59

Total.....	\$ 22,800.02	\$ 21,581.78	\$ 1,218.24
------------	--------------	--------------	-------------

	Year Ended June 30, 1955	Year Ended June 30, 1954	Increase (Decrease)
<i>Commission on Colleges and Universities:</i>			
<i>Salaries:</i>			
Secretary.....	\$ 9,000.00	\$ 7,500.00	\$ 1,500.00
Associate and assistant secretary.....	9,333.33	6,000.00	3,333.33
Retirement Annuity.....	675.00	612.50	62.50
Clerical and stenographic.....	6,553.16	6,765.74	(212.58)
Board of Review.....	5,145.01	3,034.69	2,110.32
Committee on athletics.....	857.07	2,889.28	(2,032.21)
Committee on professional education.....	1,246.44	941.92	304.52
Committee on reorganization of accrediting pro- cedures.....	1,487.76	1,646.01	(158.25)
Committee on planning.....	587.45	1,775.88	(1,188.43)
Junior College Study Committee.....	—	43.79	(43.79)
Dues.....	100.00	100.00	—
Office expense.....	3,229.19	4,448.17	(1,218.98)
Committee on graduate study in education.....	290.26	—	290.26
 Total.....	 \$ 38,504.67	 \$ 35,757.98	 \$ 2,746.69
<i>Executive Committee:</i>			
Executive Committee.....	\$ 2,648.25	\$ 2,388.57	\$ 259.68
<i>Television Committee:</i>			
Television Committee.....	\$ 333.02	\$ 471.31	\$ (138.29)
<i>Public Relations Committee:</i>			
Public Relations Committee.....	\$ 1,445.87	\$ 2,732.60	\$ (1,286.73)
<i>Reorganization Committee:</i>			
Reorganization Committee.....	\$ 421.76	\$ 813.45	\$ (391.69)
<i>Publicity Committee:</i>			
Publicity Committee.....	\$ 2,598.73	\$ 1,194.84	\$ 1,403.89
<i>President's Office:</i>			
President's Office.....	\$ 500.00	\$ 366.13	\$ 133.87
<i>Defense Committee:</i>			
Defense Committee.....	\$ 15,802.40	\$ 30,069.07	\$ (14,266.67)
<i>Quarterly Office:</i>			
Clerical assistance.....	\$ 2,899.92	\$ 2,799.96	\$ 99.96
Office expense.....	327.99	174.64	153.35
Quarterly issues.....	7,631.43	8,445.97	(814.54)
 Total.....	 \$ 10,859.34	 \$ 11,420.57	 \$ (561.23)
<i>Secretary's Office:</i>			
<i>Salaries:</i>			
Secretary.....	\$ 6,000.00	\$ —	\$ 6,000.00
Clerical.....	4,099.97	3,900.00	199.97
Office expense.....	472.11	357.76	114.35
 Total.....	 \$ 10,572.08	 \$ 4,257.76	 \$ 6,314.32

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR

233

	Year Ended June 30, 1955	Year Ended June 30, 1954	Increase (Decrease)
<i>Treasurer's Office:</i>			
Clerical assistance.....	\$ 2,400.00	\$ 1,999.92	\$ 400.00
Office expense.....	467.35	642.09	(174.74)
Total.....	\$ 2,867.35	\$ 2,642.01	\$ 225.34
<i>General Association:</i>			
Traveling expense.....	\$ 1,190.85	\$ 1,198.92	\$ (8.07)
Printing.....	4,565.13	3,882.74	682.39
Miscellaneous.....	301.01	585.05	(284.04)
Annual meeting.....	2,821.81	2,689.94	131.87
Social security taxes.....	504.15	335.85	168.30
Total.....	\$ 9,382.95	\$ 8,692.50	\$ 690.45
<i>Other:</i>			
Inspection and survey expense.....	\$ 14,081.35	\$ 10,102.37	\$ 3,978.98
Royalties paid.....	101.97	201.24	(99.27)
Bank service charges.....	.50	12.76	(12.26)
Total.....	\$ 14,183.82	\$ 10,316.37	\$ 3,867.45
Total Expense.....	\$138,052.33	\$138,138.69	\$ (86.36)

Publications of the North Central Association

Unless otherwise indicated, address communications to the Secretary, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Charles W. Boardman, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis Minnesota.

- I. THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, Editorial Office, 4019 University High School Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- II. Publications produced or sponsored by Committees or Subcommittees of the Commission on Research and Service.
 - A. Unit Studies in American Problems—a new and challenging type of classroom text materials sponsored by the Committee on Experimental Units for the use of students in high-school social studies classes. Charles E. Merrill Company, 400 S. Front Street, Columbus 15, Ohio.
 1. *Atomic Energy*, by WILL R. BURNETT
 2. *Conservation of Natural Resources*, by E. E. LORY and C. L. RHYNE
 3. *Housing in the United States*, by A. W. TROELSTRUP
 4. *Latin America and Its Future*, by RYLAND W. CRARY
 5. *Maps and Facts for World Understanding*
 6. *Why Taxes?* by EDWARD A. KRUG and ROBERT S. HARNACK
 7. *The Federal Government and You*
 8. *Youth and Jobs*, by DOUGLAS S. WARD
 9. *The Family and You*, by HENRY A. BOWMAN
 - B. Unit Studies for Better Learning—McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.
 1. *Sprouting Your Wings*, by BRUCE H. GUILD
 - C. Pamphlets produced as outgrowths of committee studies and projects.
 1. Study of Teacher Certification.
 2. Developing the Health Education Program.
 3. Better Teaching Through Audio-Visual Materials. (10¢)
 4. Report of the Self-Study Survey of Guidance Practices in North Central Association High Schools for the School Year 1947-48 and Check List of Elements in a Minimum and an Extended Program of Guidance and Counseling. (10¢)
 5. Better Colleges, Better Teachers—Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York.
 6. Incentives used in Motivating Professional Growth of Teachers. (single copies 25¢; quantities of 10 or more 15¢ each)
 7. The Workshop as an In-Service Education Procedure (single copies 25¢; quantities of 10 or more 15¢ each).
 - D. *Syllabus—Functional Health Training*, by LYNDA M. WEBER. Published and distributed by Ginn and Company, Chicago.
- III. Publications of the Commission on Secondary Schools, distributed free to members of the Commission and member schools.
 - A. *Policies, Regulations, and Criteria for the Approval of Secondary Schools*
 - B. *Handbook for State Chairmen and Reviewing Committees*
- IV. Publications available from the Office of the Secretary, Commission on Colleges and Universities, North Central Association, 5835 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois.
 - A. *Revised Manual of Accrediting*. \$2.00 (unbound)
 - B. Reprints from the NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY and other pamphlets available in limited numbers, free of charge.
 1. Annual list of institutions of higher education accredited by the Commission on Colleges and Universities.
 2. "Principles of Freedom in Teaching and Research," an extract from *The Evaluation of Higher Institutions*, Vol. II. *The Faculty*.
 3. "Know Your North Central Association," 1955.

4. "Faculty Inquiry into Intercollegiate Athletics," 1953 (A guide to a self-evaluative procedure for faculty committees that may wish to use it).
5. "Athletics in Some of the Better Colleges and Universities," April, 1953.
6. "The Impact of Foundations on Higher Education." Addresses by ROBERT D. CALKINS, WILMER SHIELDS RICH, and L. K. TUNKS, 1954.
7. "Faculty Training and Salaries in Institutions of Higher Education," by MANNING M. PATTILLO and ALLAN P. PFNISTER, April, 1955.

V. Publications jointly sponsored by the North Central Association and other educational organizations or agencies.

- A. *A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services*, 1954 Revision: Formal Service Courses in Schools. Published in cooperation with the American Council on Education and eighteen other accrediting and standardizing educational associations. Order from the American Council on Education, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington 6, D.C. \$5.00.
- B. Publications of Cooperative Study of Secondary School Standards. Available from 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington 6, D.C.
 1. *How to Evaluate a Secondary School* (1940 Edition), paper \$1.10
 2. *Evaluative Criteria* (1950 Edition), paper \$2.50; set of separate sections \$2.50 each
 3. *Educational Temperatures* (1940 Edition), \$1.25

VI. *A History of the North Central Association*, by CALVIN O. DAVIS, 1945. Pp. xvii+286, \$2.00 plus postage. Available from Editorial Office of THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, 4019 University High School, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

